E 449
.W441

THE

BIBLE AGAINST SLAVERY.

AN INQUIRY

INTO THE

PATRIARCHAL AND MOSAIC SYSTEMS

ON THE SUBJECT OF

HUMAN RIGHTS.

By Theodore Dwight Weld

183—

W. L. 25/2/11

CONTENTS.

Definition of Slavery - - - - - - 3

Man-stealing—Examination of Ex. xxi. 16 - - - 9

Import of "Bought with money," etc. - - - 15

Rights and privileges of servants - - - - 21

No involuntary servitude under the Mosaic system - - 24

Servants were paid wages - - - - - 31

Masters, not owners - - - - - 36

Servants distinguished from property - - - - 38

Social equality of servants with their masters - - - 40

Condition of the Gibeonites, as subjects of the Hebrew Commonwealth - 41

Egyptian bondage analyzed - - - - 43

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

"Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be," etc. Gen. ix. 25 47

"For he is his money," Examination of, Ex. xxi. 20, 21 - - 52

"Bondmen and bondmaids" bought of the heathen. Lev. xxv. 44—46 54

"They shall be your bondmen forever." Lev. xxv. 46 - - 56

"Ye shall take them as an inheritance," etc. Lev. xxv. 46 - - 58

The Israelite to serve as a hired servant. Lev. xxv. 39, 40 - 60

Difference between bought and hired servants - - - 61

Bought servants the most privileged class - - - 61

Summary of the different classes of servants - - - 70

Disabilities of the servants from the heathen - - - 72

Examination of Exodus xxi. 2—6 - - - - 73

The Canaanites not sentenced to unconditional extermination - 75

INQUIRY, &c.

THE spirit of slavery never takes refuge in the Bible *of its own accord*. The horns of the altar are its last resort. It seizes them, if at all, only in desperation—rushing from the terror of the avenger's arm. Like other unclean spirits, it "hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest its deeds should be reproved." Goaded to phrenzy in its conflicts with conscience and common sense, denied all quarter, and hunted from every covert, it breaks at last into the sacred enclosure, and courses up and down the Bible, "seeking rest, and finding none." THE LAW OF LOVE, streaming from every page, flashes around it an omnipresent anguish and despair. It shrinks from the hated light, and howls under the consuming touch, as demons recoiled from the Son of God, and shrieked, "Torment us not." At last, it slinks away among the shadows of the Mosaic system, and thinks to burrow out of sight among its types and shadows. Vain hope! Its asylum is its sepulchre; its city of refuge, the city of destruction. It rushes from light into the sun; from heat, into devouring fire; and from the voice of God into the thickest of His thunders.

DEFINITION OF SLAVERY.

If we would know whether the Bible is the charter of slavery, we must first determine *just what slavery is*. The thing itself must be separated from its appendages. A constituent element is one thing; a relation another; an appendage another. Relations and appendages presuppose *other* things, of which there are relations and appendages. To regard them as *the things* to which they pertain, or as constituent parts of them, leads to endless fallacies. A great variety of conditions, relations, and tenures, indispensable to the social state, are confounded with slavery; and thus slaveholding is deemed quite harmless, if not virtuous. We will specify some of the things which are often confounded with slavery.

1. *Privation of the right of suffrage.* Then *minors* are slaves.

2. *Ineligibility to office.* Then *females* are slaves.

3. *Taxation without representation.* Then three-fourths of the people of Rhode Island are slaves, and *all* in the District of Columbia.

4. *Privation of one's oath in law.* Then the *free* colored people of Ohio are slaves, so are disbelievers in a future retribution, generally.

5. *Privation of trial by jury.* Then all in France and Germany are slaves.

6. *Being required to support a particular religion.* Then the people of England are slaves. [To the preceding may be added all other disabilities, merely *political.*]

7. *Cruelty and oppression.* Wives are often cruelly treated; hired domestics are often oppressed; but these forms of oppression are not slavery.

8. *Apprenticeship.* The rights and duties of master and apprentice are correlative and reciprocal. The *claim* of each upon the other results from the *obligation* of each to the other. Apprenticeship is based on the principle of equivalent for value received. The rights of the apprentice are secured, and his interests are promoted equally with those of the master. Indeed, while the law of apprenticeship is *just* to the master, it is *benevolent* to the apprentice. Its main design is rather to benefit the apprentice than the master. It *promotes* the interests of the former, while it guards from injury those of the latter in (ng it. It secures to the master a mere legal compensation, while it secures to the apprentice both a legal compensation, and a virtual gratuity in addition, the apprentice being of the two decidedly the greatest gainer. The law not only recognizes the *right* of the apprentice to a reward for his labor, but appoints the wages, and enforces the payment. The master's claim covers only the *services* of the apprentice. The apprentice's claim covers *equally* the services of the master. The master cannot hold the apprentice as property, nor the apprentice the master; but each holds property in the services of the other, and BOTH EQUALLY. Is this slavery?

9. *Filial subordination and parental claims.* Both are nature's dictates, and indispensable to the existence of the social state; their *design* the promotion of mutual welfare; and the *means*, those natural affections created by the relation of parent and child, and blending them in one by irrepressible affinities; and thus, while exciting each to discharge those offices incidental to the relation, they constitute a shield for mutual protection. The parent's legal claim to the services of his children, while minors, is a slight boon for the care and toil of their rearing, to

say nothing of outlays for support and education. This provision for the good of the *whole*, is, with the greater part of mankind, indispensable to the preservation of the family state. The child, in helping his parents, helps himself—increases a common stock, in which he has a share; while his most faithful services do but acknowledge a debt that money cannot cancel.

10. *Bondage for crime, or governmental claims on criminals.* Must innocence be punished because guilt suffers penalties? True, the criminal works for the government without pay; and well he may. He owes the government. A century's work would not pay its drafts on him. He is a public defaulter, and will die so. Because laws make men pay their debts, shall those be forced to pay who *owe nothing?* Besides, the law makes no criminal, PROPERTY. It restrains his liberty; it makes him pay something, a mere penny in the pound, of his debt to the government; but it does not make him a *chattel*. Test it. To own property is to own its product. Are children born of convicts government property? Besides, can *property* be *guilty?* Are *chattels* punished?

11. *Restrictions upon freedom.* Children are restrained by parents, wards by guardians, pupils by teachers, patients by physicians and nurses, corporations by charters, and legislators by constitutions. Embargoes, tariffs, quarantine, and all other laws, keep men from doing as they please. Restraints are the web of civilized society, warp and woof. Are they slavery? then civilized society is a mammoth slave—a government of LAW, *the climax of slavery*, and its executive a king among slaveholders.

12. *Involuntary or compulsory service.* A juryman is empannelled *against his will*, and sit he *must*. A sheriff orders his posse; bystanders *must* turn in. Men are *compelled* to remove nuisances, pay fines and taxes, support their families, and "turn to the right as the law directs," however much *against their wills*. Are they therefore slaves? To confound slavery with involuntary service is absurd. Slavery is a *condition*. The slave's *feelings* toward it, are one thing; the condition itself, the object of these feelings, is *another* thing; his feelings cannot alter the nature of that condition. Whether he *desire* or *detest* it, the *condition* remains the same. The slave's *willingness* to be a slave is no palliation of his master's guilt in holding him. Suppose the slave verily thinks himself a chattel, and consents that others may so regard him, does that *make* him a chattel, or make those guiltless who *hold* him as such? I may be sick of life, and I tell the assassin so that stabs me; is

he any the less a murderer because I *consent* to be made a corpse? Does my partnership in his guilt blot out his part of it? If the slave were willing to be a slave, his *voluntariness*, so far from *lessening* the guilt of the "owner," *aggravates* it. If slavery has so palsied his mind and he looks upon himself as a chattel, and consents to be one, actually *to hold him as such*, falls in with his delusion, and confirms the impious falsehood. *These very feelings and convictions of the slave*, (if such were possible) increase a hundred fold the guilt of the master in holding him as property, and call upon him in thunder, immediately to recognize him as a MAN, and thus break the sorcery that binds his soul, cheating it of its birth-right, and the consciousness of its worth and destiny.

Many of the foregoing conditions and relations are *appendages* of slavery, and some of them inseparable from it. But no one, nor all of them together, constitute its *intrinsic unchanging element.*

We proceed to state affirmatively that,

ENSLAVING MEN IS REDUCING THEM TO ARTICLES OF PROPERTY, making free agents chattels, converting *persons* into *things*, sinking intelligence, accountability, immortality, into *merchandize*. A *slave* is one held in this condition. He is a mere tool for another's use and benefit. In law "he owns nothing, and can acquire nothing." *His right to himself is abrogated.* He is another's property. If he say *my* hands, *my* feet, *my* body, *my* mind, MY*self*, they are figures of speech. To *use himself* for his own good is a CRIME. To keep what he *earns* is stealing. To take his body into his own keeping is *insurrection*. In a word, the *profit* of his master is the END of his being, and he, a *mere means* to that end, a *mere means* to an end into which his interests do not enter, of which they constitute no portion.* MAN sunk to a *thing!* the intrinsic element, the *principle* of slavery; MEN sold, bartered, leased, mortgaged, bequeathed, invoiced, shipped in cargoes, stored as goods, taken on executions, and knocked off at public outcry! Their *rights* another's con-

* Whatever system sinks man from an END to a *means*, or in other words, whatever transforms him from an object *of* instrumentality into a mere instrumentality *to* an object, just so far makes him a *slave*. Hence West India apprenticeship retains in *one* particular the cardinal principle of slavery. The apprentice, during three-fourths of his time, is still forced to labor, and robbed of his earnings; just so far forth he is a *mere means*, a *slave*. True, in all other respects, slavery is abolished in the British West Indies. Its bloodiest features are blotted out—but the meanest and most despicable of all—forcing the poor to work for the rich without pay three-fourths of their time, with a legal officer to flog them if they demur at the outrage, is one of the provisions of the "Emancipation Act!" For the glories of that luminary, abolitionists thank God, while they mourn that it rose behind clouds, and shines through an eclipse.

veniences, their interests, wares on sale, their happiness, a household utensil; their personal inalienable ownership, a serviceable article, or plaything, as best suits the humor of the hour; their deathless nature, conscience, social affections, sympathies, hopes, marketable commodities! We repeat it, *the reduction of persons to things;* not robbing a man of privileges, but of *himself;* not loading with burdens, but making him a *beast of burden;* not *restraining* liberty, but subverting it; not curtailing rights, but abolishing them; not inflicting personal cruelty, but annihilating *personality*; not exacting involuntary labor, but sinking him into an *implement* of labor; not abridging his human comforts, but abrogating his *human nature;* not depriving an animal of immunities, but *despoiling a rational being of attributes,* uncreating a MAN to make room for a *thing!*

That this is American slavery, is shown by the laws of slave states. Judge Stroud, in his "Sketch of the Laws relating to Slavery," says, "The cardinal principle of slavery, that the slave is not to be ranked among sentient beings, but among *things*—is an article of property, a chattel personal, obtains as undoubted law in all of these states," (the slave states.) The law of South Carolina thus lays down the principle, "Slaves shall be deemed, held, taken, reputed, and adjudged in law to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their owners and possessors, and their executors, administrators, and assigns, to ALL INTENTS, CONSTRUCTIONS, AND PURPOSES WHATSOEVER." Brevard's Digest, 229. In Louisiana, "a slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he *belongs*; the master may sell him, dispose of his *person, his industry, and his labor;* he can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing, but what must belong to his master." Civil Code of Louisiana, Art. 35.

This is American slavery. The eternal distinction between a person and a thing, trampled under foot—the crowning distinction of all others—their centre and circumference—the source, the test, and the measure of their value—the rational, immortal principle, embalmed by God in everlasting remembrance, consecrated to universal homage in a baptism of glory and honor, by the gift of His Son, His Spirit, His Word, His presence, providence, and power; His protecting shield, upholding staff, and sheltering wing; His opening heavens, and angels ministering, and chariots of fire, and songs of morning stars, and a great voice in heaven, proclaiming eternal sanctions, and confirming the word with signs following.

Having stated the *principle* of American slavery, we ask,

DOES THE BIBLE SANCTION SUCH A PRINCIPLE?* To the *law* and the *testimony*. First, the moral law, or the ten commandments. Just after the Israelites were emancipated from their bondage in Egypt, while they stood before Sinai to receive the law, as the trumpet waxed louder, and the mount quaked and blazed, God spake the ten commandments from the midst of clouds and thunderings. *Two* of those commandments deal death to slavery. Look at the eighth, "*Thou shalt not steal*," or, thou shalt not take from another what belongs to him. All man's powers of body and mind are God's gift to *him*. That they are *his own*, and that he has a right to them, is proved from the fact that God has given them to *him alone*, that each of them is a part of *himself*, and all of them together *constitute* himself. All *else* that belongs to man is acquired by the *use* of these powers. The *interest* belongs to him, because the *principal* does—the product is his, because he is the *producer*. Ownership of any thing is ownership of its *use*. The right to use according to will, is *itself* ownership. The eighth commandment *presupposes and assumes the right of every man to his powers, and their product*. Slavery robs of both. A man's right to himself is the only right absolutely original and intrinsic—his right to whatever else that belongs to him is merely *relative* to his right to himself—is derived from it, and held only by virtue of it. SELF-RIGHT is the *foundation right*—the *post in the middle*, to which all other rights are fastened. Slaveholders, the world over, when talking about their RIGHT to their slaves, always assume *their own right to themselves*. What slaveholder ever undertook to prove his own right to himself? He knows it to be a self-evident proposition, that *a man belongs to himself*—that the right is intrinsic and absolute. The slaveholder, in making out his own title to himself, makes out the title of every human being to *himself*. As the fact of being *a man* is itself the title, the whole human family have one common title deed. If *one* man's title is valid, *all* are valid. If one is worthless, all are. To deny the validity of the *slave's* title is to deny the validity of *his own*; and yet in the act of making him a slave, the slaveholder *asserts* the validity of his own title, while he seizes *him* as his property who has the *same* title. Further, in making him a slave,

* The Bible record of actions is no comment on their moral character. It vouches for them as *facts*, not as *virtues*. It records without rebuke, Noah's drunkenness, Lot's incest, and the lies of Jacob and his mother—not only single acts, but *usages*, such as polygamy and concubinage, are entered on the record without censure. Is that *silent entry* God's *endorsement?* Because the Bible, in its catalogue of human actions, does not stamp on every crime its name and number, and write against it, *this is a crime*—does that wash out its guilt, and bleach it into a virtue?

he does not merely unhumanize *one* individual, but UNIVERSAL MAN. He destroys the foundations. He annihilates *all rights*. He attacks not only the human race, but *universal being*, and rushes upon JEHOVAH.—For rights are *rights ;* God's are no more—man's are no less.

The eighth commandment forbids the taking of *any* part of that which belongs to another. Slavery takes the *whole*. Does the same Bible which forbids the taking of *any* thing belonging to him, sanction the taking of *every* thing? Is it such a medley of absurdities as to thunder wrath against him who robs his neighbor of a *cent*, while it bids God speed to him who robs his neighbor of *himself*? Slavery is the highest possible violation of the eighth commandment. To take from a man his earnings, is theft. But to take the *earner*, is compound, superlative, perpetual theft. It is to be a thief by profession. It is a trade, a life of robbery, that vaults through all the gradations of the climax at a leap—the dread, terrific, giant robbery, that towers among other robberies, a solitary horror, monarch of the realm. The eighth commandment forbids the taking away, and the *tenth* adds, "*Thou shalt not* COVET *any thing that is thy neighbor's ;*" thus guarding every man's right to himself and his property, by making not only the actual taking away a sin, but even that state of mind which would *tempt* to it. Who ever made human beings slaves, or held them as slaves without *coveting* them? Why do they take from them their time, their labor, their liberty, their right of self-preservation and improvement, their right to acquire property, to worship according to conscience, to search the Scriptures, to live with their families, and their right to their own bodies? Why do they *take* them, if they do not *desire* them? They COVET them for purposes of gain, convenience, lust of dominion, of sensual gratification, of pride and ostentation. *They break the tenth commandment*, and pluck down upon their heads the plagues that are written in the book. *Ten* commandments constitute the brief compend of human duty. *Two* of these brand slavery as sin.

The giving of the law at Sinai, immediately preceded the promulgation of that body of laws and institutions, called the "Mosaic system." Over the gateway of that system, fearful words were written by the finger of God—"HE THAT STEALETH A MAN AND SELLETH HIM, OR IF HE BE FOUND IN HIS HAND, HE SHALL SURELY BE PUT TO DEATH." See Exodus, xxi. 16.

The oppression of the Israelites in Egypt, and the wonders wrought for their deliverance, proclaim the reason for *such* a law at *such* a time—when the body politic became a theocracy, and reverently waited for

the will of God. They had just been emancipated. The tragedies of their house of bondage were the realities of yesterday, and peopled their memories with thronging horrors. They had just witnessed God's testimony against oppression in the plagues of Egypt—the burning blains on man and beast—the dust quickened into loathsome life, and cleaving in swarms to every living thing—the streets, the palaces, the temples, and every house heaped up with the carcasses of things abhorred—even the kneading troughs and ovens, the secret chambers and the couches, reeking and dissolving with the putrid death—the pestilence walking in darkness at noonday, the devouring locusts and hail mingled with fire, the first-born death-struck, and the waters blood, and, last of all, that dread high hand and stretched out arm, that whelmed the monarch and his hosts, and strewed their corpses in the sea. All this their eyes had looked upon,—earth's proudest city, wasted and thunder-scarred, lying in desolation, and the doom of oppressors traced on her ruins in the hand writing of God, glaring in letters of fire mingled with blood—a blackened monument of wrath to the uttermost against the stealers of men.

No wonder that God, in a code of laws prepared for such a people at such a time, should light up on its threshold a blazing beacon to flash terror on slaveholders. "*He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall be surely put to death.*" Ex. xxii. 16. God's cherubim and flaming sword guarding the entrance to the Mosaic system! See also Deut. xxiv. 7.*

The Hebrew word, *Gaunab*, here rendered *stealeth*, means the taking from another what *belongs* to him, whether it be by violence or fraud; the same word is used in the eighth commandment, and prohibits both *robbery* and theft.

The crime specified is that of *depriving* SOMEBODY *of the ownership of a man.* Is this somebody a master? and is the crime that of depriving a *master* of his *servant?* Then it would have been "he that stealeth" a *servant, not* "he that stealeth a *man.*" If the crime had been the taking of an individual from *another*, then the *term* used would have been *expressive of that relation*, and *most especially* if it was the relation of property and *proprietor!*

* Jarchi, the most eminent of the Jewish writers, (if we except perhaps the Egyptian Maimonides,) who wrote seven hundred years ago, in his comment on this stealing and making merchandize of men, gives the meaning thus:—"Using a man against his will, as a servant lawfully purchased; yea, though he should use his services ever so little, only to the value of a farthing, or use but his arm to lean on to support him, *if he be forced so to act as a servant*, the person compelling him but once to do so shall die as a thief, whether he has sold him or not."

The crime, as stated in the passage, is three-fold—man *stealing*, *selling* and *holding*. All are put on a level, and whelmed under one penalty—DEATH. This *somebody* deprived of the ownership of man, is the *man himself*, robbed of personal ownership. Joseph said to the servants of Pharoah, "Indeed I was *stolen* away out of the land of the Hebrews." Gen. xl. 15. How *stolen?* His brethren took him and sold him as an *article of merchandize*. Contrast this penalty for *man*-stealing with that for *property*-stealing. Exod. xxii. If a man stole an *ox* and killed or sold it, he was to restore five oxen; if he had neither sold nor killed it, the penalty was two oxen. The selling or the killing being virtually a deliberate repetition of the crime, the penalty was more than doubled.

But in the case of stealing a *man*, the first act drew down the utmost power of punishment; however often repeated, or however aggravated the crime, human penalty could do no more. The fact that the penalty for *man*-stealing was death, and the penalty for *property*-stealing, the mere *restoration of double*, shows that the two cases were adjudicated on totally different principles. The man stolen might be past labor, and his support a *burden*, yet death was the penalty, though not a cent's worth of *property value* was taken. The penalty for stealing *property* was a mere *property-penalty*. However large the amount stolen, the payment of *double* wiped out the score. It might have a greater *money* value than a *thousand* men, yet *death* was never the penalty, nor maiming, nor branding, nor even *stripes*. Whatever the kind, or the amount stolen, the unvarying penalty was double of *the same kind*. Why was not the rule uniform? When a *man* was stolen why not require the thief to restore *double of the same kind—two men*, or if he had sold him, *five* men? Do you say that the man-thief might not *have* them? So the *ox*-thief might not have two *oxen*, or if he had killed it, *five*. But if God permitted men to hold *men* as property, equally with *oxen*, the *man*-thief could get *men* with whom to pay the penalty, as well as the *ox*-thief, *oxen*.

Further, when *property* was stolen, the whole of the legal penalty was a compensation to the person injured. But when a *man* was stolen, no property compensation was offered. To tender *money* as an equivalent, would have been to repeat the outrage with the intolerable aggravations of supreme insult and impiety. Compute the value of a MAN in *money!* Throw dust into the scale against immortality! The law recoiled from such outrage and blasphemy. To have permitted the man-thief to expiate his crime by restoring double, would have

been making the repetition of crime its atonement. But the infliction of death for *man-stealing* exacted from the guilty wretch the utmost possibility of reparation. It wrung from him, as he gave up the ghost, a testimony in blood, and death-groans, to the infinite dignity and worth of man,—a proclamation to the universe, voiced in mortal agony, that MAN IS INVIOLABLE,—a confession shrieked in phrenzy at the grave's mouth—" I die accursed, and God is just."

If God permitted man to hold *man* as property, why did he punish for stealing *that* kind of property infinitely more than for stealing any *other* kind of property? Why did he punish with *death* for stealing a very little, perhaps not a sixpence worth, of *that* sort of property, and make a mere *fine*, the penalty for stealing a thousand times as much, of any other sort of property—especially if God did by his own act annihilate the difference between man and *property*, by putting him *on a level with it?*

The atrociousness of a crime, depends greatly upon the nature, character, and condition of the victim. To steal is a crime, whoever the thief, or whatever the plunder. To steal bread from a *full* man, is theft; to steal it from a *starving* man, is both theft and murder. If I steal my neighbor's *property*, the crime consists not in the *nature* of the article, but in *shifting its external relation* from *him* to *me*. But when I take my neighbor *himself*, and first make him *property*, and then *my* property, the latter act, which was the sole crime in the former case, dwindles to a mere appendage. The sin in stealing a man does not consist in transferring, from its owner to another, that which is *already property*, but in turning *personality* into *property*. True, the *attributes* of man still remain, but the rights and immunities which grow out of them are *annihilated*. It is the first law of reason and revelation to regard things and beings as they are; and the sum of religion, to feel and act toward them according to their nature and value. Knowingly to treat them otherwise, is *sin;* and the degree of violence done to their nature, relations, and value, measures its guilt. When things are sundered which God has indissolubly joined, or confounded in one, which he has separated by infinite extremes; when sacred and eternal distinctions, which he has garnished with glory, are derided and set at nought, then, if ever, *sin* reddens in its "scarlet dye." The sin specified in the passage, is that of doing violence to the *nature* of a *man*—his *intrinsic value* and relations as a rational being, and blotting out the exalted distinction stamped upon him by his Maker. In the verse preceding, and in that which follows, the *same principle* is laid down. Verse 15,

"*He that smiteth his father or his mother shall surely be put to death.*" Verse 17, "*He that curseth his father or his mother, shall surely be put to death.*" If a Jew smote his neighbor, the law merely smote him in return. But if that same blow were given to a *parent*, the law struck the smiter *dead*. Why this difference in the punishment of the same act, inflicted on different persons? Answer—God guards the parental relation with peculiar care. It is the *centre* of human relations. To violate that, is to violate *all*. Whoever trampled on *that*, showed that *no* relation had any sacredness in his eyes—that he was unfit to move among human relations who had violated one so sacred and tender.—Therefore, the Mosaic law uplifted his bleeding corpse, and brandished the ghastly terror around the parental relation to guard it from impious inroads.

But why the difference in the penalty since the *act* was the same? The sin had divers aggravations.

1. The relation violated was obvious—the distinction between parents and others, manifest, dictated by natural affection—a law of the constitution.

2. The act was violence to nature—a suicide on constitutional susceptibilities.

3. The parental relation then, as now, was the centre of the social system, and required powerful safe-guards. "*Honor thy father and thy mother*," stands at the head of those commands which prescribe the duties of man to man; and, throughout the Bible, the parental relation is God's favorite illustration, of his own relations to the whole family of man. In this case, death is inflicted not at all for the act of *smiting*, nor for smiting a *man*, but a *parent*—for violating a vital and sacred relation—a *distinction* cherished by God, and around which, both in the moral and ceremonial law, He threw up a bulwark of defence. In the next verse, "He that stealeth a man," &c., the SAME PRINCIPLE is wrought out in still stronger relief. The crime here punished with death, is not the mere act of taking property from its owner, but the disregarding of *fundamental relations*, doing violence to an *immortal nature*, making war on a *sacred distinction* of priceless worth. That distinction which is cast headlong by the principle of American slavery, which makes MEN "*chattels*."

The incessant pains-taking throughout the Old Testament, in the separation of human beings from brutes and things, shows God's regard for the sacredness of his own distinction.

"In the beginning" the Lord uttered it in heaven, and proclaimed it to the universe as it rose into being. He arrayed creation at the instant of its birth, to do it reverent homage. It paused in adoration while He ushered forth its crowning work. Why that dread pause, and that creating arm held back in mid career, and that high conference in the godhead? "*Let us make man in* OUR IMAGE, *after* OUR LIKENESS, AND LET HIM HAVE DOMINION *over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.*"

Then while every living thing, with land, and sea, and firmament, and marshalled worlds, waited to catch and swell the shout of morning stars —THEN "GOD CREATED MAN IN HIS OWN IMAGE. IN THE IMAGE OF GOD CREATED HE HIM." This solves the problem, IN THE IMAGE OF GOD CREATED HE HIM. Well might the sons of God cry all together, "Amen, alleluia"—"*Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive blessing and honor*"—"*For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet. O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth.*" Psalms viii. 5, 6, 9. The frequent and solemn repetition of this distinction by God proclaims his infinite regard. The 26th, 27th, and 28th verses of the 1st chapter of Genesis are little else than the repetition of it in various forms. In the 5th chapter, 1st verse, we find it again—"In the day that God created man, IN THE LIKENESS OF GOD MADE HE MAN." In the 9th chapter, 6th verse, we find it again. After giving license to shed the blood of "every moving thing that liveth," it is added, "*Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed, for* IN THE IMAGE OF GOD MADE HE MAN." As though he had said, "All these other creatures are your property, designed for your use—they have the likeness of earth, they perish with the using, and their spirits go downward; but this other being, MAN, has my own *likeness:* IN THE IMAGE OF GOD made I man; an intelligent, moral, immortal agent, invited to all that I can give and he can be." So in Levit. xxiv. 17, 18, "*He that killeth any* MAN *shall surely be put to death; and he that killeth a beast shall make it good, beast for beast; and he that killeth a* MAN *shall be put to death.*" So in the passage quoted above, Ps. viii. 5, 6. What an enumeration of particulars, each separating infinitely, MEN from brutes and things!

1. "*Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels.*" Slavery drags him down among *brutes.*

2. "*And hast crowned him with glory and honor.*" Slavery tears off his crown, and puts on a *yoke*.

3. "*Thou madest him to have dominion* OVER *the works of thy hands.*" Slavery breaks his sceptre, and casts him down *among* those works—yea, *beneath them*.

4. "*Thou hast put all things under his feet.*" Slavery puts HIM *under the feet of an owner*, with beasts and creeping things. Who, but an impious scorner, dare thus strive with his Maker, and mutilate HIS IMAGE, and blaspheme the Holy One, who saith to those that grind his poor, "*Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these, ye did it unto me.*"

But time would fail us to detail the instances in which this distinction is most impressively marked in the Bible.

In further prosecuting this inquiry, the Patriarchal and Mosaic systems will be considered together, as each reflects light upon the other, and as many regulations of the latter are mere *legal* forms of Divine institutions previously existing. As a *system*, however, the latter alone is of Divine authority. Whatever were the usages of the *patriarchs*, God has not made them our examplars.*

Before entering upon an analysis of the condition of servants under these two states of society, let us settle the import of certain terms which describe the mode of procuring them.

IMPORT OF THE WORD "BUY," AND THE PHRASE "BOUGHT WITH MONEY."

From the direction to the Israelites to "buy" their servants, and from the phrase "bought with money," applied to Abraham's servants, it is argued that they were articles of *property*. The sole ground for this belief is the *terms* "buy" and "bought with money," and such an import to these terms when applied to servants is assumed, not only in the absence of all proof, but in the face of evidence to the contrary. How much might be saved, if in discussion, the thing to be proved was always *assumed*. To *beg* the question in debate, what economy of mid-

* Those who insist that the patriarchs held slaves, and sit with such delight under their shadow, hymming the praises of "those good old patriarchs and slaveholders," might at small cost greatly augment their numbers. A single stanza celebrating patriarchal *concubinage*, winding off with a chorus in honor of patriarchal *drunkenness*, would be a trumpet call, summoning from bush and brake, highway and hedge, and sheltering fence, a brotherhood of kindred affinities, each claiming Abraham or Noah as his patron saint, and shouting, "My name is legion." What a myriad choir, and thunderous song!

night oil! what a forestaller of premature wrinkles, and grey hairs! Instead of protracted investigation into Scripture usage, and painful collating of passages, and cautiously tracing minute relations, to find the meaning of Scripture terms, let every man boldly resolve to interpret the language of the oldest book in the world, by the usages of his own time and place, and the work is done. And then what a march of mind! Instead of *one* revelation, they might be multiplied as the drops of the morning! Every man might take orders as an inspired interpreter, with an infallible clue to the mind of the Spirit, if he only understood the dialect of his own neighborhood! We repeat it, the only ground of proof that these terms are to be interpreted to mean, when applied to servants in the Bible, the same that they mean when applied to our *slaves, is the terms themselves.*

What a Babel-jargon it would make of the Bible to take it for granted that the sense in which words are *now* used is the *inspired* sense.

David says, "I prevented the dawning of the morning, and cried." What a miracle-worker, to stop the earth in its revolution! Rather too fast. Two hundred years ago, *prevent* was used in the strict Latin sense to *come before*, or *anticipate*. It is always used in this sense in the Old and New Testaments. David's expression, in the English of the nineteenth century, is, "Before the dawning of the morning I cried," or, I began to cry before day-break. "So my prayer shall *prevent* thee." "Let us *prevent* his face with thanksgiving." "Mine eyes *prevent* the night watches." "We shall not *prevent* them that are asleep," &c. In almost every chapter of the Bible, words are used in a sense now nearly or quite obsolete, and sometimes in a sense totally *opposite* to their present meaning. A few examples follow: "Oftentimes I purposed to come to you, but was *let* (hindered) hitherto." "And the four *beasts* (living ones) fell down and worshipped God,"—"Whosoever shall *offend* (cause to sin) one of these little ones,"—"Go out into the high ways and *compel* (urge) them to come in,"—"Only let your *conversation* (habitual conduct or course of life) be as becometh the Gospel,"—"They that seek me *early* (earnestly) shall find me,—"Give me *by and-by* (now) in a charger, the head of John the Baptist,"—"So when tribulation or persecution ariseth *by-and-by* (immediately) they are offended. Nothing is more mutable than language. Words, like bodies, are continually throwing off particles and absorbing others. So long as they are mere *representatives*, elected by the whims of universal suffrage, their meaning will be a perfect volatile, and to cork it up for the next century is an employment sufficiently silly, (to speak within

bounds,) for a modern Bible dictionary maker. There never was a shallower conceit than that of establishing the sense attached to a word centuries ago, by showing what it means *now*. Pity that hyper-fashionable mantuamakers and milliners were not a little quicker at taking hints from some of our Doctors of Divinity. How easily they could save their pious customers all qualms of conscience about the weekly shiftings of fashion, by demonstrating that the last importation of Parisian indecency, just now flaunting here on promenade, was the identical style of dress in which the pious Sarah kneaded cakes for the angels, the modest Rebecca drew water for the camels of Abraham's servants. Since such fashions are rife in Chestnut-street and Broadway *now*, they *must* have been in Canaan and Pandanaram four thousand years ago!

II. 1. The inference that the word buy, used to describe the procuring of servants, means procuring them as *chattels*, seems based upon the fallacy—that whatever *costs* money *is* money; that whatever or whoever you pay money *for*, is an article of property, and the fact of your paying for it *proves* that it is property. The children of Israel were required to *purchase* their first-born out from under the obligations of the priesthood, Numb. xviii. 15, 16; Exod. xxxiv. 20. This custom is kept up to this day among the Jews, and the word *buy* is still used to describe the transaction. Does this prove that their first-born were, or are, held as property? They were *bought* as really as were *servants*. So the Israelites were required to *pay money* for their own souls. This is called sometimes a ransom, sometimes an atonement. Were their *souls* therefore marketable commodities?

2. Bible saints *bought* their wives. Boaz *bought* Ruth. "So Ruth the Moabitess, the wife of Mahlon, have I *purchased* to be my wife." Ruth iv. 10. Hosea bought his wife. "So I *bought* her to me for fifteen pieces of silver, and for an homer of barley, and an half homer of barley." Hosea iii. 2 Jacob *bought* his wives Rachel and Leah, and not having money, paid for them in labor—seven years a piece. Gen. xxix. 15—29. Moses probably bought his wife in the same way, and paid for her by his labor, as the servant of her father. Exod. ii. 21. Shechem, when negociating with Jacob and his sons for Dinah, says, "What ye shall say unto me, I will *give*. Ask me never so much dowry and gift, and I will give according as ye shall say unto me." Gen. xxxiv. 11, 12. David purchased Michal, Saul's daughter, and Othniel, Achsah, the daughter of Caleb, by performing perilous services for the benefit of their fathers-in-law. 1 Sam. xviii. 25—27; Judges i. 12, 13. That the purchase of wives, either with money or by service

was the general practice, is plain from such passages as Exod. xxii. 17, and 1 Sam. xviii. 25. Among the Jews of the present day this usage exists, though it is now a mere form, there being no *real* purchase. Yet among their marriage ceremonies, is one called "marrying by the penny." The coincidences, not only in the methods of procuring wives and servants, and in the terms employed in describing the transactions, but in the prices paid for each, are worthy of notice. The highest price of wives (virgins) and servants was the same. Compare Deut. xxii. 28, 29, and Exod. xxii. 17, with Lev. xxvii. 2—8. The *medium* price of wives and servants was the same. Compare Hosea iii. 2, with Exod. xxi. 2. Hosea appears to have paid one half in money and the other in grain. Further, the Israelitish female bought-servants were *wives*, their husbands and their masters being the same persons. Exod. xxi. 8, and Judges xix. 3, 27. If *buying* servants among the Jews shows that they were property, then buying *wives* shows that *they* were property. The words in the original used to describe the one, describe the other. Why not contend that the wives of the ancient fathers of the faithful were their chattels, and used as ready change at a pinch? And thence deduce the rights of modern husbands. How far gone is the Church from primitive purity! How slow to emulate illustrious examples! Alas! Patriarchs and prophets are followed afar off! When will pious husbands live up to their Bible privileges, and become partakers with Old Testament worthies in the blessedness of a husband's rightful immunities! Surely professors of religion now, are *bound* to buy and hold their wives as property! Refusing so to do, is to question the morality of those "good old" wife-trading "patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," with the prophets, and a host of whom the world was not worthy.

The use of the word buy, to describe the procuring of wives, is not peculiar to the Hebrew. In the Syriac language, the common expression for "the married," or "the espoused," is "the bought." Even so late as the 16th century, the common record of *marriages* in the old German Chronicles was "A. BOUGHT B."

The Hebrew word translated *buy*, is, like other words, modified by the nature of the subject to which it is applied. Eve says, "I have *gotten* (bought) a man of the Lord." She named him Cain, that is, *bought*. "He that heareth reproof, getteth (buyeth) understanding, Prov. xv. 32. So in Isa. xi. 11. "The Lord shall set his hand again to recover (to *buy*) the remnant of his people." So Ps. lxxviii. 54. He brought them to this mountain which his right hand had *purchased*,

i. e. gotten. Jer. xiii. 4. "Take the girdle that thou hast got" (bought.) Neh. v. 8. "We of our ability have *redeemed* (bought) our brethren that were sold to the heathen." Here "*bought*" is not applied to persons who were made slaves, but to those taken *out* of slavery. Prov. 8. 22. "The Lord possessed (bought) me in the beginning of his way before his works of old." Prov. xix. 8. "He that *getteth* (buyeth) wisdom loveth his own soul." Prov. xvi. 16. "How much better is it to *get* (buy) wisdom than gold?" Finally, to *buy* is a *secondary* meaning of the Hebrew word *Kana*.

4. Even at this day the word *buy* is used to describe the procuring of servants, where slavery is abolished. In the British West Indies, where slaves became apprentices in 1834, they are still "bought." This is now the current word in West India newspapers. So a few years since in New-York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and even now in New-Jersey servants are "*bought*" as really as in Virginia. And the different senses in which the same word is used in the two states, puts no man in a quandary, whose common sense amounts to a modicum.

So under the system of legal *indenture* in Illinois, servants now are "*bought.*"* A short time since, hundreds of foreigners who came to this country were "bought" annually. By voluntary contract they engaged to work for their purchasers a given time to pay for their passage. This class of persons called "redemptioners," consisted at one time of thousands. Multitudes are *bought out* of slavery by themselves or others, and remove into free states. Under the same roof with the writer is a "servant bought with money." A few weeks since, she was a slave. As soon as "bought," she was a slave no longer. Alas! for our leading politicians if "buying" men makes them "chattels." The Whigs say that Benton and Rives were "bought" by the administration with the surplus revenue; and the other party, that Clay and Webster were "bought" by the Bank. The histories of the revolution tell us that Benedict Arnold was "bought" by British gold. Did that make him an article of property? When a northern clergyman marries a rich southern widow, country gossip hits off the indecency with this current phrase, "The cotton bags *bought* him." When Robert Walpole said, "Every man has his price, and whoever will pay it can *buy* him," and when John Randolph said, while the Missouri question was pending,

* The following statute is now in force in the state of Illinois—"No negro, mulatto, or Indian, shall at any time *purchase* any servant other than of their own complexion: and if any of the persons aforesaid shall presume to *purchase* a white servant, such servant shall immediately become free, and shall be so held, deemed, and taken."

"The northern delegation is in the market; give me money enough, and I can *buy* them," they both meant *just what they said*. When the temperance publications tell us that candidates for office *buy* men with whiskey; and the oracles of street tattle, that the court, district attorney, and jury, in the late trial of Robinson were *bought*, we have no floating visions of "chattels personal," man auctions, or coffles.

The transaction between Joseph and the Egyptians gives a clue to the meaning attached to "buy" and "bought with money." See Gen. xlvii. 18—26. The Egyptians proposed to Joseph to become servants, and that he should *buy* them. When the bargain was closed, Joseph said, "Behold I have *bought you* this day," and yet it is plain that neither of the parties dreamed that the persons *bought* were in any sense articles of property, but merely that they became thereby obligated to labor for the government on certain conditions, as a *compensation* for the entire support of themselves and families during the famine. And that the idea attached to "buy us," and "behold I have bought you," was merely the procuring of services voluntarily offered, and secured by contract, as a return for *value received*, and not at all that the Egyptians were bereft of their personal ownership, and made articles of property. And this buying of *services* (they were to give one-fifth part of their crops to Pharaoh) is called in Scripture usage, *buying the persons*. This case deserves special notice, as it is the only one where the whole transaction of buying servants is detailed—the preliminaries, he process, the mutual acquiescence, and the permanent relation resulting therefrom. In all other instances, the *mere fact* is stated without entering into particulars. In this case, the whole process is laid open.

1. The persons "bought," *sold themselves*, and of their own accord.

2. Obtaining permanently the *services* of persons, or even a portion of them, is called "buying" those persons. The objector, at the outset, assumes that servants were bought of *third* persons; and thence infers that they were articles of property. This is sheer *assumption*. Not a single instance is recorded, of a servant being sold by any one but himself; not a case, either under the patriarchal, or the Mosaic systems, in which a *master sold his servant*. That the servants who were "bought" *sold themselves*, is a fair inference from various passages of Scripture.

In Leviticus xxv. 47, the case of the Israelite, who became the servant of the stranger, the words are, "If he SELL HIMSELF unto the stranger." The *same word*, and the same *form* of the word, which, in the 47th verse, is rendered *sell himself*, is in the 39th verse of the same

chapter, rendered *be sold;* in Deut. xxviii. 68, the same word is rendered "be sold." Here it is the Hithpael conjugation, which is reflexive in its force, and, like the middle voice in Greek, represents what an individual does for himself, or in his own concerns; and should manifestly have been rendered, ye shall *offer yourselves* for sale. For a clue to Scripture usage on this point, see 1 Kings xxi. 20, 25—"Thou hast *sold thyself* to work evil." "There was none like to Ahab that *sold himself* to work wickedness."—2 Kings xvii. 17. "They used divination and enchantments, and *sold themselves* to do evil."—Isa. l. 1. "For your iniquities have ye *sold yourselves.*" Isa. lii. 3, "Ye have *sold yourselves* FOR NOUGHT, and ye shall be redeemed without money." See also, Jeremiah xxxiv. 14—Romans vii. 14, and vi. 16—John viii. 34, and the case of Joseph and the Egyptians, already quoted.

Again, if servants were *bought of third persons*, where are the instances? In the purchase of wives, though spoken of rarely, it is generally stated that they were bought of *third* persons. Is it not a fair inference, if servants were bought of third persons, that there would *sometimes* have been such an intimation?

II.—THE LEADING DESIGN OF THE MOSAIC LAWS RELATING TO MASTERS AND SERVANTS, WITH AN ENUMERATION OF THE RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES SECURED TO SERVANTS.

The general object of those statutes, which prescribed the relations of master and servant, was the good of both parties—but more especially the good of the *servants*. While the interests of the master were specially guarded from injury, those of the servants were *promoted.*

These laws were a merciful provision for the poorer classes, both of the Israelites and Strangers. Not laying on burdens, but lightening them—they were a grant of *privileges*—a bestowment of *favors.*

1. *No servant from the Strangers, could remain a servant in the family of an Israelite, without becoming a proselyte.* Compliance with this condition was the *price of the privilege.*—Genesis xvii. 9—14, 23, 27.

2. *Excommunication from the family was a* PUNISHMENT.—Genesis xxi. 14—Luke xvi. 2—4.

3. *The fact that every Hebrew servant could* COMPEL *his master to keep him after the six years contract had expired,* shows that the system was framed to advance the interests and gratify the wishes of the servant *quite as much* as those of the master. If the servant *demanded* it, the

law *obliged* the master to retain him in his household, however little he might need his services, or great his dislike to the individual. Deut. xv. 12—17, and Exodus xxi. 2—6.

4. *The rights and privileges guaranteed by law to all servants.*

(1.) *They were admitted into covenant with God.* Deut. xxix. 10—13.

(2.) *They were invited guests at all the national and family festivals of the household in which they resided.* Exodus xii. 43—44; Deut. xii. 12, 18, and xvi. 10—16.

(3.) *They were statedly instructed in morality and religion.* Deut. xxxi. 10—13; Joshua viii. 33—35; 2 Chronicles xvii. 8—9.

(4.) *They were released from their regular labor nearly* ONE HALF OF THE WHOLE TIME. During which, the law secured to them their entire support; and the same public and family instruction that was provided for the other members of the Hebrew community.

(a.) The Law secured to them the *whole of every seventh year*; Lev. xxv. 3—6; thus giving to those servants that remained such during the entire period between the jubilees, *eight whole years* (including the Jubilee year) of unbroken rest.

(b.) *Every seventh day.* This in forty-two years, (the eight being subtracted from the fifty) would amount to just *six years.*

(c.) *The three great annual festivals.* The *Passover*, which commenced on the 15th of the 1st month, and lasted seven days, Deut. xvi. 3, 8. The Pentecost, or Feast of Weeks, which began on the sixth day of the third month, and lasted seven days. Lev. xvi. 10, 11. And the Feast of Tabernacles, which commenced on the 15th of the seventh month, and lasted eight days. Deut. xvi. 13, 15; Lev. xxiii. 34—39. As all met in one place, much time would be spent on the journey. Their cumbered caravans moved slowly. After their arrival at the place of sacrifice, a day or two at least, would be requisite for divers preparations, before entering upon the celebration of the festival, besides some time at the close of it, in preparations for their return. If we assign three weeks to each festival—including the time spent on the journey going and returning, and the delays before and after the celebration, together with the *festival week*; it will be a small allowance for the cessation of their regular labor. As there were three festivals in the year, the main body of the servants would be absent from their stated employments at least *nine weeks annually*, which would amount in forty-two years, subtracting the sabbaths, to six years and eighty-four days.

(e.) *The new moons.* The Jewish year had twelve; Josephus tells us that the Jews always kept *two* days for the new moon. See Calmet on the Jewish Calender, and Horne's Introduction; also 1 Sam. xx. 18, 19, 27. This would amount in forty-two years, to two years, two hundred and eighty days, after the necessary subtractions.

(f.) *The feast of trumpets.* On the first day of the seventh month, and of the civil year. Lev. xxiii. 24, 25.

(g.) *The day of atonement.* On the tenth of the seventh month. Lev. xxiii. 27—32.

These two last feasts would consume not less than sixty-five days of time not otherwise reckoned.

Thus it appears that those persons who continued servants during the whole period between the jubilees, were by law released from their labor, TWENTY-THREE YEARS AND SIXTY-FOUR DAYS, OUT OF FIFTY YEARS, and those who remained a less time, in nearly the same proportion. In the foregoing calculation, besides making a generous donation of all the *fractions* to the objector, we have left out of the account, those numerous *local* festivals to which frequent allusion is made, as in Judges xxi. 19; 1 Sam. 9th chapter. And the various *family* festivals, such as at the weaning of children; at marriages; at sheep shearings; at the making of covenants, &c., to which reference is often made, as in 1st Sam. xx. 28, 29. Neither have we included those memorable festivals instituted at a later period of the Jewish history. The feast of Purim, Esther, ix. 28, 29; and the feast of the Dedication, which lasted eight days. John x. 22; 1 Mac. iv. 59.

Finally, the Mosaic system secured to servants, an amount of time, which, if distributed, would on an average be almost ONE HALF OF THE DAYS IN EACH YEAR. Meanwhile, they and their families were supported, and furnished with opportunities of instruction. If this amount of time were distributed over *every day*, the servants would have *to themselves*, all but a *fraction of* ONE HALF OF EACH DAY, and would labor for their masters the remaining fraction and the other half of the day.

THIS REGULATION IS A PART OF THAT MOSAIC SYSTEM WHICH IS CLAIMED BY SLAVEHOLDERS AS THE GREAT PROTOTYPE OF AMERICAN SLAVERY.

5. *The servant was protected by law equally with the other members of the community.*

Proof—"*Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his neighbor, and* THE STRANGER THAT IS WITH HIM." "*Ye shall not* RESPECT PERSONS *in judgment, but ye shall hear*

the SMALL *as well as the great.*" Deut. i. 16, 17. Also in Lev. xxiv. 22. "*Ye shall have one manner of law as well for the stranger, as for one of your own country, for I am the Lord your God.*" So Numbers xv. 29. "*Ye shall have* ONE LAW *for him that sinneth through ignorance, both for him that is born among the children of Israel, and for the* STRANGER *that sojourneth among them.*" Deut. xxvii. 19. "*Cursed be he that* PERVERTETH THE JUDGMENT OF THE STRANGER, *the fatherless and the widow.*"

6. *The Mosaic system enjoined upon the Israelites the greatest affection and kindness toward their servants, foreign as well as Jewish.*

Lev. xix. 34. "*The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself.*" Also Deut. x. 17, 19. "*For the Lord your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords, a great God, a mighty and a terrible, which* REGARDETH NOT PERSONS, *nor taketh reward. He doth execute the judgment of the fatherless and widow, and* LOVETH THE STRANGER, *in giving him food and raiment,* LOVE YE THEREFORE THE STRANGER." So Exodus xxii. 21. "*Thou shalt neither vex a stranger nor oppress him.*" Exodus xxiii. 9. "*Thou shalt not oppress a stranger, for ye know the heart of a stranger.*" Lev. xxv. 35, 36. "*If thy brother be waxen poor thou shalt relieve him, yea, though he be a* STRANGER *or a sojourner, that he may live with thee, take thou no usury of him or increase, but fear thy God.*" [What an absurdity to suppose that *this same stranger* could be taken by one that *feared his God*, held as a *slave*, and robbed of time, earnings, and all his rights!]

7. *Servants were placed upon a level with their masters in all civil and religious rights.* See Numbers xv. 15, 16, 29. Numb. ix. 14. Deut. i. 16, 17. Lev. xxiv. 22.

III.—DID PERSONS BECOME SERVANTS VOLUNTARILY, OR WERE THEY MADE SERVANTS AGAINST THEIR WILLS?

We argue that they became servants *of their own accord*,

1. Because to become a servant in the family of an Israelite, was to abjure idolatry, to enter into covenant with God,* to be circumcised in

* Maimonides, who wrote in Egypt about seven hundred years ago, a cotemporary with Jarchi, and who stands with him at the head of Jewish writers, gives the following testimony on this point:

"Whether a servant be born in the power of an Israelite, or whether he be purchased from the heathen, the master is to bring them both into the covenant.

token of it, to be bound to the observance of the Sabbath, of the Passover, the Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles, and to receive instruction in all the particulars of the moral and ceremonial law.

Were the servants *forced* through all these processes? Was the renunciation of idolatry *compulsory?* Were they *dragged* into covenant with God? Were they seized and circumcised by *main strength?* Were they *compelled* mechanically to chew, and swallow, the flesh of the Paschal lamb, while they abhorred the institution, despised its ceremonies, spurned the law which enjoined it, detested its author and executors, and instead of rejoicing in the deliverance which it commemmorated, bewailed it as a calamity, and cursed the day of its consummation? Were they *driven* from all parts of the land three times in the year up to the annual festivals? Were they drugged with instruction which they nauseated? Were they goaded through a round of ceremonies, to them senseless and disgusting mummeries; and drilled into the tactics of a creed rank with loathed abominations?

We repeat it, to become a *servant*, was to become a *proselyte*. And how did God authorize his people to make proselytes? At the point of the sword? By the terror of pains and penalties? By converting men into *merchandise?* Were *proselyte* and *chattel* synonymes, in the Divine vocabulary? Must a man be sunk to a *thing* before taken into covenant with God? Was this the stipulated condition of adoption, and the sole passport to the communion of the saints?

2. We argue the voluntariness of servants from Deut. xxiii. 15, 16, "*Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee. He shall dwell with thee, even among you, in that place which he shall choose, in one of thy gates where it liketh him best; thou shalt not oppress him.*"

"But he that is in the *house* is entered on the eighth day, and he that is bought with money, on the day on which the master receives him, unless the slave be *unwilling*. For if the master receive a grown slave, and he be *unwilling*, his master is to bear with him, to seek to win him over by instruction, and by love and kindness, for one year. After which, should he *refuse* so long, it is forbidden to keep him, longer than a year. And the master must send him back to the strangers from whence he came. For the God of Jacob will not accept any other than the worship of a *willing* heart."—Maimon, Hilcoth, Miloth, Chap. 1st, Sec. 8th.

The ancient Jewish Doctors agree in the testimony, that the servant from the strangers who at the close of his probationary year still refused to adopt the religion of the Mosaic system, and was on that account cut off from the family, and sent back to his own people, received a *full compensation* for his services, besides the payment of his expenses. But that *postponement* of the circumcision of the foreign servant for a year (*or even at all* after he had entered the family of an Israelite) of which the Mishnic doctors speak, seems to have been *a mere usage*. We find nothing of it in the regulations of the Mosaic system. Circumcision was manifestly a rite strictly *initiatory*. Whether it was a rite merely *national* or *spiritual*, or *both*, comes not within the scope of this inquiry. Nor does it at all affect the argument.

As though God had said, "To deliver him up would be to recognize the *right* of the master to hold him. His *fleeing* " shows his *choice*—proclaims his wrongs, his master's oppressive acts, and his own claim to legal protection." You shall not force him back, and thus recognize the *right* of the master to hold him in such a condition as induces him to flee to others for protection." It may be objected, that this command had no reference to servants among the *Israelites*, but only to those of *heathen* masters in the surrounding nations. We answer, The regulation has no restriction. Its terms are unlimited. But the objection, even if valid, merely shifts the pressure of the difficulty to another point. Does God array his infinite authority to protect the *free choice* of a *single* servant from the heathen, and yet *authorize* the same persons, to crush the free choice of *thousands* of servants from the heathen? Suppose a case. A *foreign* servant flees from his master to the Israelites; God speaks, "He shall dwell with thee, in that place which *he shall choose*, in one of thy gates where it *liketh* him best." They were strictly charged not to put him in a condition which he did not *choose*. Now, suppose this same servant, instead of coming into Israel of his own accord, had been *dragged* in by some kidnapper who *bought* him of his master, and *forced* him into a condition against his will. Would He who forbade such treatment of the stranger, who *voluntarily* came into the land, sanction the *same* treatment of the *same person*, provided in *addition* to this last outrage, the *previous* one had been committed of *forcing him into the nation against his will?*

To commit violence on the free choice of a *foreign* servant is a horrible enormity, forsooth, PROVIDED you *begin* the violence *after* he has come among you. But if you commit the *first act* on the *other side of the line;* if you *begin* the outrage by buying him from a third person *against his will*, and then tear him from home, and drag him across the line into the land of Israel, and hold him as a slave—ah! that alters the case, and you may perpetrate the violence now with impunity! Would *greater* favor have been shown to this new comer from the heathen than to the old residents—those who had been servants in Jewish families perhaps for a generation? Were the Israelites commanded to exercise toward *him*, uncircumcised and *out* of the covenant, a justice and kindness denied to the multitudes who *were* circumcised, and *within* the covenant?

Again: the objector finds small gain to his argument on the supposition that the covenant respected merely the fugitives from the surrounding nations, while it left the servants of the Israelites in a condition

against their wills—the objector finds small gain to his argument. In that case, the surrounding nations would of course adopt retaliatory measures, and resolve themselves into so many asylums for fugitive Israelitish servants. As these nations were on every side of them such a proclamation would have been an effectual lure to men held in a condition which was a constant *counteraction of will.* Further, the objector's assumption destroys itself, for the same command which protected the foreign servant from the power of his *master*, protected him equally from the power of an *Israelite.* It was not merely, "Thou shalt not deliver him to his *master*," but "he (the servant) shall dwell with thee, in that place which *he shall choose* in one of thy gates where it liketh him best." Every Israelite was commanded to respect his free choice, and to put him in no condition *against his will.* What was this but a proclamation, that all who *chose* to live in the land and obey the laws, were left to their own free will, to dispose of their services at such a rate, to such persons, and in such places as they pleased?

Besides, grant that this command prohibited the sending back of *foreign* servants merely, was there any law requiring the return of servants who had escaped from the *Israelites?* There was a statute requiring the return of *property* lost, and *cattle* escaped, but none requiring the return of escaped *servants.*

Finally, these verses contain, *first*, a command, "Thou shalt not deliver," &c. *Secondly,* a declaration of the fugitive's right of *free choice*, and of God's will that he should exercise it at his own discretion; and *thirdly*, a command guarding this right, namely, "Thou shalt not oppress him," as though God had said, If you forbid him to exercise his *own choice*, as to the place and condition of his residence, it is *oppression*, and I will not tolerate it.

3. *We argue the voluntariness of servants from their peculiar opportunities and facilities for escape.* Three times every year, all the males over twelve years of age, were required to attend the public festivals. The main body were thus absent from their homes not less than three weeks each time, making nine weeks annually. As these caravans moved over the country, were there military scouts lining the way, to intercept deserters?—a corporal's guard stationed at each pass of the mountains, sentinels pacing the hill-tops, and light horse scouring the defiles? What safe contrivance had the Israelites for taking their "*slaves*" three times in a year to Jerusalem and back? When a body of slaves is moved any distance in our free and equal *republic*, they are handcuffed to keep them from running away, or beating their drivers' brains

out. Was this the *Mosaic* plan, or an improvement left for the wisdom of Solomon? The usage, doubtless, claims a paternity not less venerable and biblical! Perhaps they were lashed upon camels, and transported in bundles, or caged up, and trundled on wheels to and fro, and while at the Holy City, "lodged in jail for safe keeping," religious services *extra* being appointed, and special "ORAL instruction" for their benefit. But meanwhile, what became of the sturdy *handmaids* left at home? What hindered them from marching off in a body? Perhaps the Israelitish matrons stood sentry in rotation round the kitchens, while the young ladies scoured the country, as mounted rangers, to pick up stragglers by day, and patrolled the streets as city guards, keeping a sharp look-out at night.

4. *Their continuance in Jewish families depended upon the performance of various rites and ceremonies necessarily* VOLUNTARY.

Suppose a servant from the heathen should, upon entering a Jewish family, refuse circumcision; the question whether he shall remain a servant, is in his own hands. If a *slave*, how simple the process of emancipation! His *refusal* did the job. Or, suppose that, at any time, he should refuse to attend the tri-yearly feasts, or should eat leavened bread during the Passover, or compound the ingredients of the anointing oil, he is "cut off from the people;" *excommunicated.*

5. *We infer the voluntariness of the servants of the Patriarchs from the impossibility of their being held against their wills.* The servants of Abraham are an illustration. At one time he had three hundred and eighteen *young men* "born in his house," and probably many more *not* born in his house. The whole number of his servants of all ages, was probably MANY THOUSANDS. Doubtless, Abraham was a man of a million, and Sarah too, a right notable housekeeper; still, it is not easy to conceive how they contrived to hold so many thousand servants against their wills, unless the patriarch and his wife *took turns* in performing the Hibernian exploit of surrounding them! The neighboring tribes, instead of constituting a picket guard to hem in his servants, would have been far more likely to sweep them and him into captivity, as they did Lot and his household. Besides, Abraham had neither "Constitution," nor "compact," nor statutes, nor judicial officers to send back his fugitives, nor a truckling police to pounce upon panic-stricken women, nor gentleman-kidnappers, suing for patronage, volunteering to howl on the track, boasting their blood-hound scent, and pledging their "honor" to hunt down and "deliver up," *provided* they had a description of the "flesh-marks," and were stimulated in their chivalry by

pieces of silver. Abraham seems also to have been sadly deficient in all the auxiliaries of family government, such as stocks, hand-cuffs, foot-chains, yokes, gags, and thumb-screws. His destitution of these patriarchal indispensables is the more afflicting, when we consider his faithful discharge of responsibilities to his household, though so deplorably destitute of the needful aids.

6. *We infer that servants were voluntary, from the fact that there is no instance of an Israelitish master ever* SELLING *a servant.* Abraham had thousands of servants, but appears never to have sold one. Isaac "grew until he became very great," and had "great store of servants." Jacob's youth was spent in the family of Laban, where he lived a servant twenty-one years. Afterward he had a large number of servants.

When Joseph sent for Jacob to come into Egypt, the words are, "thou and thy children, and thy children's children, and thy flocks and thy herds, and ALL THAT THOU HAST." Jacob took his flocks and herds but *no servants.* Gen xlv. 10; xlvii. 6; xlvii. 1. His servants doubtless, served under their *own contracts*, and when Jacob went into Egypt, they *chose* to stay in their own country.

The government might sell *thieves*, if they had no property, until their services had made good the injury, and paid the legal fine. Ex. xxii. 3. But *masters* seem to have had no power to sell their *servants* —the reason is obvious. To give the master a *right* to sell his servant, would annihilate the servant's right of choice in his own disposal; but says the objector, To give the master a right to *buy* a servant, equally annihilates the servant's *right of choice.* Answer. It is one thing to have a right to buy a man, and a very different thing to have a right to buy him of *another* man.

Though there is no instance of a servant being bought of his, or her master, yet there are instances of young females being bought of their *fathers.* But their purchase as *servants* was their betrothal as WIVES. Exodus xxi. 7, 8. "*If a man sell his daughter to be a maid-servant, she shall not go out as the men-servants do. If she please not her master* WHO HATH BETROTHED HER TO HIMSELF, *he shall let her be redeemed.*"*

* The comment of Maimonides on this passage is as follows:

"A Hebrew handmaid might not be sold but to one who laid himself under obligations, to espouse her to himself or to his son, when she was fit to be betrothed."—*Maimonides—Hilcoth—Obedim*, Ch. IV. Sec. XI.

Jarchi, on the same passage, says, "He is bound to espouse her and take her to be his wife for the *money of her purchase* is the money of her *espousals.*"

7. *We infer that the Hebrew servant was voluntary in* COMMENCING *his service, because he was pre-eminently so* IN CONTINUING *it.* If, at the year of release, it was the servant's *choice* to remain with his master, so did the law guard his free will, that it required his ear to be bored by the judges of the land, thus making it impossible for the servant to be held in an involuntary condition. Yea, so far was his *free choice* protected, that his master was compelled to keep him, however much he might wish to get rid of him.

8. *The method prescribed for procuring servants, recognized their choice, and was an appeal to it.* The Israelites were commanded to offer them a suitable *inducement*, and then leave them to decide. They might neither seize them by *force*, nor frighten them by *threats*, nor wheedle them by false pretences, nor *borrow* them, nor *beg* them; but they were commanded to BUY them;* that is, they were to recognize the *right* of the individuals to their own services—their right to *dispose* of them, and their right to *refuse all offers.* They might, if they pleased, refuse all applications, and thus oblige those who made them, *to do their own work.* Suppose all, with one accord, *refused* to become servants, what provision did the Mosaic law make for such an emergency? NONE.

9. *Various incidental expressions throughout the Bible, corroborate the idea that servants became such by virtue of their own contract.* Job xli. 4, is an illustration, "*Will he* (Leviathan) *make a* COVENANT *with thee? wilt thou take him for a* SERVANT *forever?*"

10. *The transaction which made the Egyptians the* SERVANTS OF PHAROAH, *shows entire voluntariness throughout.* It is detailed in Gen. xlvii. 18—26. Of their own accord, they came to Joseph and said, "We have not aught left but our *bodies* and our lands; *buy* us;" then in the 25th verse, "*Thou hast saved our lives: let us find grace in the sight of my Lord, and we will be servants to Pharaoh.*"

11. *We argue that the condition of servants was an* OPTIONAL *one from the fact that* RICH *strangers did not become servants.* Indeed, so far were they from becoming servants themselves, that *they bought and held Jewish servants.* Lev. xxv. 47.

12. *The sacrifices and offerings which* ALL *were required to present, were to be made* VOLUNTARILY. Lev. i. 2, 3.

13. *Mention is often made of persons becoming servants where they were manifestly and pre-eminently* VOLUNTARY. The case of the Pro-

* The case of thieves, whose services were sold until they had earned enough to make restitution to the person wronged, and to pay the legal penalty, *stands by itself*, and has no relation to the condition of servants.

phet Elisha is one. 1 Kings xix. 21; 2 Kings iii. 11. Elijah was his *master*. The original word, translated master, is the same that is so rendered in almost every instance where masters are spoken of throughout the Mosaic and patriarchal systems. It is translated *master* eighty-five times in our English version. Moses was the servant of Jethro. Exodus iii. 1. Joshua was the servant of Moses. Numbers xi. 28. Jacob was the servant of Laban. Genesis xxix, 18—27.

IV. Were the servants forced to work without pay?

Having already shown that the servants became and continued such of *their own accord*, it would be no small marvel if they *chose* to work without pay. Their becoming servants, pre-supposes *compensation* as a motive.

That they *were paid* for their labor, we argue,

1. *Because, while Israel was under the Mosaic system, God rebuked in thunder, the sin of using the labor of others without wages.* "*Wo unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness, and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbor's service without wages, and giveth him not for his work.*" Jer. xxii. 13. Here God testifies that to use the service of others without wages is "unrighteousness," and He commissions his "wo" to burn upon the doer of the "wrong." This "wo" was a permanent safeguard of the *Mosaic system*. The Hebrew word *Rea*, here translated *neighbor*, does not mean one man, or class of men, in distinction from others, but *any one with whom we have to do* —all descriptions of persons, not merely servants and heathen, but even those who prosecute us in lawsuits, and enemies while in the act of fighting us—"*As when a man riseth against his* NEIGHBOR *and slayeth him.*" Deut. xxii. 26. "*Go not forth hastily to strive, lest thou know not what to do in the end thereof, when thy* NEIGHBOR *hath put thee to shame.*" Prov. xxv. 8. "*Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy* NEIGHBOR." Exod. xx. 16. "*If any man come presumptuously upon his* NEIGHBOR *to slay him with guile.*" Exod. xxi. 14. In these, and in scores of similar cases, *Rea* is the original word.

2. *We have the testimony of God, that in our duty to our fellow men,* ALL THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS *hang upon this command,* "*Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.*" Our Saviour, in giving this command, quoted *verbatim* one of the laws of the Mosaic system. Lev. xix. 18. In the 34th verse of the same chapter, Moses commands obedience to this law in all the treatment of strangers, "*The stranger that*

dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and THOU SHALT LOVE HIM AS THYSELF." If it be loving others *as* ourselves, to make them work for us without pay; to rob them of food and clothing, as well as wages, would be a stronger illustration still of the law of love! Super-disinterested benevolence! And if it be doing to others as we would have them do to us, to make them work for *our own* good alone, Paul should be called to order for his hard sayings against human nature, especially for that libellous matter in Ephes. v. 29, "*No man ever yet hated his own flesh, but nourisheth and cherisheth it.*"

3. *As persons became servants* FROM POVERTY, *we argue that they were compensated, since they frequently owned property, and sometimes a large amount.* Ziba, the servant of Mephibosheth, gave David a princely present, "An hundred loaves of bread, and an hundred bunches of raisins, and an hundred of summer fruits, and a bottle of wine." 2 Sam. xvi. 1. The extent of his possessions can be inferred from the fact, that though the father of fifteen sons, he still employed twenty servants, of whom he was the master.

A case is stated in Leviticus xxv. 57—59, where a servant, reduced to poverty, sells himself, and it is declared that afterward he may be *redeemed*, either by his kindred, or by HIMSELF. As he was forced to sell himself from sheer poverty, he must not only have acquired property *after* he became a servant, but a considerable sum.

If it had not been common for servants to possess, and acquire property, over which they had the exclusive control, Gehazi, the servant of Elisha, would hardly have ventured to take a large sum of money, (nearly $3000*) from Naaman, (2 Kings v. 22, 23.) As it was procured by deceit, he was anxious to conceal the means used in getting it; but if the Israelitish servants, like our slaves, could "own nothing, nor acquire any thing," to embark in such an enterprise would have been consummate stupidity. The fact of having in his possession two talents of silver, would of itself convict him of theft.† But since the possession and use of property by servants, was common under the Mosaic sys-

* Though we have not sufficient data to decide with accuracy upon the *relative* value of that sum, *then* and *now*, yet we have enough to warrant us in saying that two talents of silver had far more value *then* than three thousand dollars have *now*.

† Whoever heard of the slaves in our southern states stealing a large amount of money? They "*know how to take care of themselves*" quite too well for that. When they steal, they are careful to do it on such a *small* scale, or in the taking of *such things* as will make detection difficult. No doubt they steal now and then a little, and a gaping marvel would it be if they did not. Why should they not follow in the footsteps of their masters and mistresses? Dull scholars indeed! if, after so many lessons from *proficients* in the art, who drive the business by *wholesale*, they should not occasionally copy their betters, fall into the *fashion*, and

tem, he might have it, and invest or use it, without attracting special attention. And that consideration alone would have been a strong motive to the act. His master, while he rebukes him for using such means to get the money, not only does not take it from him, but seems to expect that he would invest it in real estate, and cattle, and would procure servants with it. 2 Kings v. 26. In 1 Sam. ix. 8, we find the servant of Saul having money, and relieving his master in an emergency. Arza, the servant of Elah, was the *owner of a house*. That it was spacious and somewhat magnificent, would be a natural inference from the fact that it was a resort of the king. 1 Kings xvi. 9. The case of the Gibeonites, who, after they became servants, still occupied their cities, and remained, in many respects, a distinct people for centuries; and that of the 150,000 Canaanites, the *servants* of Solomon, who worked out their tribute of bond-service in levies, periodically relieving each other, while preparing the materials for the temple, are additional illustrations of independence in the acquisition and ownership of property.

4. *Heirship.*—Servants frequently inherited their master's property; especially if he had no sons, or if they had dishonored the family. This seems to have been a general usage.

The cases of Eliezer, the servant of Abraham; Ziba, the servant of Mephibosheth, Jarha an Egyptian, the servant of Sheshan, and the husband of his daughter; 1 Chron. ii. 34, 35, and of the *husbandmen* who said of their master's son, "*this is the* HEIR, let us kill him, *and* the INHERITANCE WILL BE OURS." Mark xii. 7, are illustrations. Also the declaration in Prov. xvii. 2—"*A wise servant shall have rule over a son that causeth shame, and* SHALL HAVE PART OF THE INHERITANCE AMONG THE BRETHREN." This passage seems to give *servants* precedence as heirs, even over the *wives* and *daughters* of their masters. Did masters hold by force, and *plunder of earnings*, a class of persons, from which, in frequent contingencies, they selected both heirs for their property, and husbands for their daughters?

try their hand in a small way, at a practice which is the *only permanent and universal* business carried on around them!

Ignoble truly! never to feel the stirrings of high impulse, prompting them to imitate the eminent pattern set before them in the daily vocation of "Honorables" and "Excellencies," and to emulate the illustrious examples of Doctors of Divinity and *Right* and *Very Reverends!* Hear President Jefferson's testimony. In his notes of Virginia, speaking of slaves, he says, "That disposition to theft with which they (the slaves) have been branded, must be ascribed to their *situation*, and not to any special depravity of the moral sense. It is a problem which I give the master to solve, whether the religious precepts against the violation of property were not framed for HIM as well as for his slave—and whether the slave may not as justifiably take a *little* from one who has taken ALL from him, as he may *slay* one who would slay him?" See Jefferson's Notes on Virginia, pp. 207—3.

5. ALL *were required to present offerings and sacrifices.* Deut. xvi. 15, 17. 2 Chron. xv. 9—11. Numb. ix. 13.

Servants must have had permanently, the means of *acquiring* property to meet these expenditures.

6. *Those Hebrew servants who went out at the seventh year, were provided by law with a large stock of provisions and cattle.* Deut. xv. 11—14. "*Thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy floor, and out of thy wine press, of that wherewith the Lord thy God hath blessed thee, thou shalt give him.*"* If it be objected, that no mention is made of the servants from the strangers, receiving a like bountiful supply, we answer, neither did the most honorable class of the *Israelitish* servants, the free-holders; and for the same reason, *they did not go out in the seventh year*, but continued until the jubilee. If the fact that no mention is made of the Gentile servants receiving such a *gratuity* proves that they were robbed of their *earnings;* it proves that the most valued class of *Hebrew* servants were robbed of theirs also, a conclusion too stubborn for even pro-slavery masticators, however unscrupulous.

7. *The servants were* BOUGHT. *In other words, they received compensation for their services in advance.* Having shown, under a previous head, that servants *sold themselves*, and of course received the compensation for themselves, (except in cases where parents hired out the time of their children until they became of age,)† a mere reference to the fact in this place is all that is required for the purposes of this argument.

8. *We infer that servants were paid, because we find masters at one time having a large number of servants, and afterwards none, without any intimation that they were sold.* The wages of servants would enable them to set up in business for themselves. Jacob, after being the servant of Laban for twenty-one years, became thus an independent herdsman, and was the master of many servants. Gen. xxx. 43, and xxxii. 15. But all these servants had left him before he went down into Egypt, having doubtless acquired enough to commence business for themselves. Gen. xlv. 10, 11, and xlvi. 1—7, 32.

9. *God's testimony to the character of Abraham.* Genesis xviii. 19.

* The comment of Maimonides on this passage is as follows—"'Thou shalt furnish him liberally,' &c. That is to say, '*Loading, ye shall load him,*' likewise every one of his family, with as much as he can take with him—abundant benefits. And if it be avariciously asked, 'How much must I give him?' I say unto *you, not less than thirty shekels*, which is the valuation of a servant, as declared in Exodus xxi. 32."—Maimonides, Hilcoth, Obedim, Chapter ii. Section 3.

† Among the Israelites, girls became of age at twelve, and boys at thirteen years.

"*For I know him that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep* THE WAY OF THE LORD TO DO JUSTICE AND JUDGMENT." We have here God's testimony, that Abraham taught his servants "the way of the Lord." What was the "way of the Lord" respecting the payment of wages where service was rendered? "*Wo unto him that useth his neighbor's service without wages!*" Jer. xxii. 13. "*Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal.*" Col. iv. 1. "*Render unto all their* DUES." Rom. xiii. 7. "*The laborer is worthy of his hire.*" Luke x. 7. How did Abraham teach his servants to "*do justice*" to others? By doing *injustice* to *them?* Did he exhort them to "render to all their dues" by keeping back *their own?* Did he teach them that "the laborer was worthy of his hire" by robbing them of *theirs?* Did he beget in them a reverence for the eighth commandment by pilfering all their time and labor? Did he teach them "not to defraud" others "in any matter" by denying *them* "what was just and equal?" If each of Abraham's pupils under such a catechism did not become a very *Aristides* in justice, then an illustrious example, patriarchal dignity, and *practical* lessons, can make but slow headway against human perverseness!

10. *Specific precepts of the Mosaic law enforcing general principles.* Out of many, we select the following:

(1.) "*Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn,*" or literally, *while he thresheth.* Deut. xxv. 4. Here is a general principle applied to a familiar case. The ox representing all domestic animals. Isaiah xxx. 24. A *particular* kind of service—*all* kinds; and a law requiring an abundant provision for the wants of an animal ministering to man in a *certain* way,—*a general principle of treatment* covering *all times, modes, and instrumentalities of service.* The object of the law was, not merely to enjoin tenderness towards brutes, but to inculcate the duty of *rewarding those who serve us,* showing that they who labor for others, are entitled to what is just and equal in return; and if such care is enjoined, by God, not merely for the ample sustenance, but for the *present enjoyment of a brute,* what would be a meet return for the services of *man?* MAN, with his varied wants, exalted nature and immortal destiny! Paul tells us expressly, that the principle which we have named, lies at the bottom of the statute. See 1 Corinthians ix. 9, 10—"*For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? Or saith he it altogether for* OUR *sakes? that he that ploweth should plow in*

HOPE, *and that he that thresheth in hope should be* PARTAKER OF HIS HOPE."

(2.) "*If thy brother be waxen poor, and fallen in decay with thee, then thou shalt relieve him,* YEA, THOUGH HE BE A STRANGER OR a SOJOURNER, *that he may live with thee Take thou no usury of him, or increase, but fear thy God. Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor lend him thy victuals for increase.*" Lev. xxv. 35—37. Or, in other words, "relief at your hands is his right, and your duty—you shall not take advantage of his necessities, but cheerfully supply them." Now, we ask, by what process of pro-slavery legerdemain, this benevolent regulation can be made to be in *keeping* with the doctrine of WORK WITHOUT PAY? Did God declare the poor stranger entitled to RELIEF, and in the same breath, *authorize* them to "*use his services without wages;*" force him to work, and ROB HIM OF ALL HIS EARNINGS? Judge ye.

V.—WERE MASTERS THE PROPRIETORS OF SERVANTS AS THEIR LEGAL PROPERTY?

The discussion of this topic has been already somewhat anticipated under the preceding heads; but a variety of considerations, not within the range of our previous inquiries, remain to be noticed.

1. *Servants were not subjected to the uses, nor liable to the contingencies of property.*

(1.) *They were never taken in payment for their masters' debts,* though children were sometimes taken (without legal authority) for the debts of a father. 2 Kings iv. 1; Job xxiv. 9; Isaiah l. 1; Matt. xviii. 25.

Cases are recorded in which creditors took from debtors property of all kinds, to satisfy their demands. In Job xxiv. 3, cattle are taken; in Prov. xxii. 27, household furniture; in Lev. xxv. 25—28, the productions of the soil; in Lev. xxv. 27—30, houses; in Exodus xxii. 26—29, and Deut. xxiv. 10—13, and Matt. v. 40, clothing; but *servants* were taken in *no instance.*

(2.) *Servants were never given as pledges. Property* of all sorts was given and held in pledge. We find in the Bible, household furniture, clothing, cattle, money, signets, and personal ornaments, with divers other articles of property, used as pledges for value received. But no *servants.*

(3.) *All lost* PROPERTY *was to be restored.* Oxen, asses, sheep, raiment, and "whatsoever lost things," are specified—servants *not.* Deut.

xxii. 13. Besides, the Israelites were expressly forbidden to take back the runaway servant to his master. Deut. xxiii. 15.

(4.) *The Israelites never gave away their servants as presents.* They made princely presents of great variety. Lands, houses, all kinds of animals, merchandize, family utensils, precious metals, and grain, armor, &c. are among their recorded *gifts*. Giving presents to superiors and persons of rank when visiting them, and at other times, was a standing usage. 1 Sam. x. 27; 1 Sam. xvi. 20; 2 Chron. xvii. 5. Abraham to Abimelech, Gen. xxi. 27; Jacob to the viceroy of Egypt, Gen. xliii. 11; Joseph to his brethren and father, Gen. xlv. 22, 23; Benhadad to Elisha, 2 Kings viii. 8, 9; Ahaz to Tiglath Pilezer, 2 Kings vi. 8; Solomon to the Queen of Sheba, 1 Kings, x. 13; Jeroboam to Ahijah, 1 Kings xiv. 3; Asa to Benhadad, 1 Kings xv. 18, 19. But no servants were given as presents—though that was a prevailing fashion in the surrounding nations. Gen. xii. 16; Gen. xx. 14.

Objection 1. *Laban* gave *handmaids to his daughters, Jacob's wives.* Without enlarging on the nature of the polygamy then prevalent, it is enough to say that the handmaids of wives, at that time, were themselves regarded as wives, though of inferior dignity and authority. That Jacob so regarded his handmaids, is proved by his curse upon Reuben, (Gen. xlix. 4, and Chron. v. 1,) also by the equality of their children with those of Rachel and Leah. But had it been otherwise—had Laban given them *as articles of property*, then, indeed, the example of this "good old patriarch and slaveholder," Saint Laban, would have been a fore-closer to all argument.

Ah! we remember his jealousy for *religion*—his holy indignation when he found that his "gods" were stolen! How he mustered his clan, and plunged over the desert in hot pursuit, seven days, by forced marches; how he ransacked a whole caravan, sifting the contents of every tent, little heeding such small matters as domestic privacy, or female seclusion, for lo! the zeal of his "images" had eaten him up!

No wonder that slavery, in its Bible-navigation, drifting dismantled before the free gusts, should scud under the lee of such a pious worthy to haul up and refit; invoking his protection, and the benediction of his "gods!"

Objection 2. *Servants were enumerated in inventories of property.* If that proves *servants* property, it proves *wives* property. "*Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's* wife, *nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's.*" Exodus xx. 17. An examination of

all the places in which servants are included among beasts, chattels, &c., will show, that in inventories of *mere property*, servants are not included, or if included, it is in such a way, as to show that they are not regarded as *property*. Eccl. ii. 7, 8. But when the design is to show, not merely the wealth, but the *greatness* of any personage, that he is a man of distinction, a ruler, a prince, servants are spoken of, as well as property. In a word, if *riches* alone are spoken of, no mention is made of servants; if *greatness*, servants and property. Gen. xiii. 2. "*And Abraham was very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold.*" No mention of *servants*. So in the fifth verse Lot's riches are enumerated, "*And Lot also had flocks, and herds, and tents.*" In the seventh verse servants are mentioned, "*And there was a strife between the* HERDMEN *of Abraham's cattle and the* HERDMEN *of Lot's cattle.*" See also Josh. xxii. 8; Gen. xxxiv. 23; Job. xlii. 12; 2 Chron. xxi. 3; xxxii. 27—29; Job i. 3—5; Deut. viii. 12—17; Gen. xxiv. 35, and xxvi. 13, and xxx. 43.

Divers facts dropped incidentally, show that when servants are mentioned in connection with property, it is in such a way as to *distinguish* them from it. When Jacob was about to leave Laban, his wives say, "All the *riches* which thou hast taken from our father, that is ours and our children's." Then follows an inventory of property. "All his cattle," "all his goods," "the cattle of his getting," &c. He had a large number of servants at the time, *but they are not included with his property*. Compare Gen. xxx. 43, with Gen. xxxi. 16—18.

When he sent messengers to Esau, in order to secure his respect, and impress him with an idea of his state and sway, he bade them tell him not only of *his* RICHES, but of his GREATNESS; that Jacob had "*oxen, and asses, and flocks, and men servants, and maid-servants.*" Gen. xxxii. 4, 5. Yet in the present which he sent, there were no servants; though he seems to have aimed to give it as much variety as possible. Gen. xxxii. 14, 15; see also Gen. xxxvi. 6, 7; Gen. xxxiv. 23. As flocks and herds were the *staples* of wealth, a large number of servants *presupposed* large possessions of cattle, which would require many herdsmen. Further. When servants are spoken of in connection with *mere property*, the terms used to express the latter do not include the former.

The Hebrew word *Mickna* is an illustration. It is a derivative of *Kana*, to procure, to buy, and its meaning is, a *possession, wealth, riches*. It occurs more than forty times in the Old Testament—and is applied always to *mere property*—generally to domestic ani-

mals, but *never* to servants. In some instances, servants are mentioned in *distinction* from the *Mickna*. See Gen. xii. 5. "*And Abraham took Sarah his wife, and Lot his brother's son. And all their* SUBSTANCE *that they had gathered, and the souls that they had gotten in Haran, and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan.*" *Substance gathered* and *souls gotten!* Many will have it, that these *souls* were a part of Abraham's *substance* (notwithstanding the pains here taken to separate them from it)—that they were *slaves*—probably captives in war, and now, by right of conquest, taken with him in his migration as part of his family effects. Who but slaveholders, either actually, or in heart, would torture into the principle and practice of slavery, such a harmless phrase as "*the souls that they had gotten?*" Until the slave trade breathed its haze upon the vision of the church, and smote her with palsy and decay, commentators saw no slavery in, "The souls that they had gotten." In the Targum of Onkelos* it is thus rendered, "The souls whom they had brought to obey the law in Haran." In the Targum of Jonathan, thus: "The souls whom they had made proselytes in Haran." In the Targum of Jerusalem, "The souls proselyted in Haran." Jarchi, placed by Jewish Rabbis at the head of their commentators, thus renders it: "The souls whom they had brought under the Divine wings." Jerome, one of the most learned of the Christian fathers: "The persons whom they had proselyted." The Persian version thus gives the whole verse, "And Abraham took Sarah his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all their wealth which they had accumulated, and the souls which they had *made*." The Vulgate version thus translates it, "Universam substantiam quam possederant et animas quas fecerant in Haran." "The entire wealth which they possessed, and the souls which they had made." The Syriac thus, "All their possessions which they possessed, and the souls which they had made in Haran." The Arabic, "All their property which they had acquired, and the souls whom they had made in Haran." The Samaritan, "All the wealth which they had gathered, and the souls which they had made in Haran." Menochius, a commentator who wrote before our present translation of the English Bible, renders it as follows:—"Quas de idol-

* The Targums are Chaldee paraphrases of parts of the Old Testament. The Targum of Onkelos is for the most part, a very accurate and faithful translation of the original, and was probably made at about the commencement of the Christian era. The Targum of Jonathan Ben Uzziel bears about the same date. The Targum of Jerusalem was probably about five hundred years later.

The Israelites, during their long captivity in Babylon, lost as a body, their knowledge of their own language. These translations of the Hebrew Scriptures into the Chaldee, the language which they acquired in Babylon, were thus called for by the necessity of the case.

otraria converterunt."* "Those whom they have converted from idolatry."—Paulus Fagius.† "Quas instituerant in religione."—"Those whom they had instructed in religion."—"Luke Francke, a German commentator who lived two centuries ago. "Quas legi subjicerant."—"Those whom they had brought to obey the law."

2. *The condition of servants in their masters' families, the privileges which they shared in common with the children, and their recognition as equals by the highest officers of the government—make the doctrine that they were mere* COMMODITIES, *an absurdity.* The testimony of Paul, in Gal. iv. 1, gives an insight into the condition of servants. "*Now I say unto you, that the heir, so long as he is a child,* DIFFERETH NOTHING FROM A SERVANT, *though he be lord of all.*"

That Abraham's servants were voluntary,—that their interests were identified with those of their master's family—that they were regarded with great affection by the household, and that the utmost confidence was reposed in them, is shown in the arming of 318 of them for the recovery of Lot and his family from captivity. See Gen. xiv. 14, 15.

When Abraham's servant went to Padanaram, the young Princess Rebekah did not disdain to say to him, "Drink, MY LORD," as "she hasted and let down her pitcher upon her hand, and gave him drink," and "she hasted and emptied her pitcher, and ran again unto the well, and drew for all his camels." Laban, the brother of Rebekah, prepared the house for his reception, *ungirded his camels, and brought him "water to wash his feet, and the men's feet that were with him!"*

In the 9th chapter of 1 Samuel, we have an account of a high festival in the city of Zuph, at which Samuel, the chief judge and ruler in Israel, presided. None sat down at the feast but those that were bidden. And only "about *thirty* persons" were invited. Quite a select party,!—the elite of the city of Zuph! Saul and his servant arrived at Zuph just as the party was assembling; and *both* of them, at Samuel's solicitation, accompany him as invited guests. "*And Samuel took Saul and his* SERVANT, *and brought* THEM *into the* PARLOR (!) *and made* THEM *sit in the* CHIEFEST SEATS *among those that were bidden.*" A *servant* invited by the chief judge, ruler, and prophet in Israel, to dine publicly with a select party, in company with his *master, who was*

* See his "Brevis explicatio sensus literalis totius Scripture."

† This eminent Hebrew scholar was invited to England by Cranmer, then Archbishop of Canterbury, to superintend the translation of the Bible into English, under the patronage of Henry the Eighth. He had hardly commenced the work when he died. This was nearly a century before the date of our present translation.

at the same time anointed King of Israel; and this servant introduced by Samuel into the PARLOR, and assigned, with his master, to the *chiefest seat* at the table! This was "*one* of the servants" of *Kish*, Saul's father; not the *steward* or the *chief* of them—not at all a *picked* man, but "*one* of the servants;" *any* one that could be most easily spared, as no endowments specially rare would be likely to find scope in looking after asses.

Again: we learn from 1 Kings xvi. 8, 9, that Elah, the King of Israel, was slain by Zimri, one of his chief officers, at a festive entertainment, in the house of Arza, his steward, or head servant, with whom he seems to have been on terms of familiarity. Without detailing other cases, we refer the reader to the intercourse between Gideon and his servant.—Judges vii. 10, 11.—Jonathan and his servant.—1 Samuel xiv. 1—14.—Elisha and his servant.

3. *The condition of the Gibeonites, as subjects of the Hebrew commonwealth, shows that they were neither articles of property, nor even* INVOLUNTARY *servants.* The condition of the inhabitants of Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kirjathjearim, under the Israelites, is quoted in triumph by the advocates of slavery; and truly they are right welcome to all the crumbs that can be gleaned from it. Milton's devils made desperate snatches at fruit that turned to ashes on their lips. The spirit of slavery raves under tormenting gnawings, and casts about in blind phrenzy for something to ease, or even to *mock* them. But for this, it would never have clutched at the Gibeonites, for even the incantations of the demon cauldron, could not extract from their case enough to tantalize starvation's self. But to the question. What was the condition of the Gibeonites under the Israelites?

(1.) *It was voluntary.* It was their own proposition to Joshua to become servants. Joshua ix. 8, 11. Their proposition was accepted, but the kind of service which they should perform, was not specified until their gross imposition came to light; they were then assigned to menial offices in the tabernacle.

(2.) *They were not domestic servants in the families of the Israelites.* They still continued to reside in their own cities, cultivating their own fields, tending their flocks and herds, and exercising the functions of a *distinct*, though not independent community. They were *subject* to the Jewish nation as *tributaries.* So far from being distributed among the Israelites, their family relations broken up, and their internal organization as a distinct people abolished, they seem to have remained a separate, and, in some respects, an independent community for many

centuries. When they were attacked by the Amorites, they applied to the Israelites as confederates for aid—it was promptly rendered, their enemies routed, and themselves left unmolested in the occupation of their cities, while all Israel returned to Gilgal. Joshua x. 6—18. Long afterwards, Saul slew some of them, and God sent upon Israel a three years' famine for it. David said to the Gibeonites, "What shall I do for you, and wherewith shall I make the atonement, that ye may bless the inheritance of the Lord?" At their demand, he delivered up to them, seven of the royal family, five of them the sons of Michal, his own former wife. 2 Samuel xxi. 1—9. The whole transaction was a formal recognition of the Gibeonites as a separate people. There is no intimation that they served families, or individuals of the Israelites, but only the "house of God," or the Tabernacle. This was established first at Gilgal, a day's journey from the cities of the Gibeonites; and then at Shiloh, nearly two days' journey from them; where it continued about 350 years. During all this period, the Gibeonites inhabited their ancient cities and territory. Only a few, comparatively, could have been absent from their cities at any one time in attendance on the tabernacle.

(1.) Whenever allusion is made to them in the history, the main body are spoken of as *at home*.

(2.) It is preposterous to suppose that their tabernacle services could have furnished employment for all the inhabitants of these four cities. One of them "was a great city, as one of the royal cities;" so large, that a confederacy of five kings, apparently the most powerful in the land, was deemed necessary for its destruction. It is probable that the men were divided into classes, and thus ministered at the tabernacle in rotation—each class a few days or weeks at a time. This service was their *national tribute* to the Israelites, rendered for the privilege of residence and protection under their government. No service seems to have been required of the *females*. As these Gibeonites were Canaanites, and as they had greatly exasperated the Israelites by impudent imposition, hypocrisy, and lying, we might assuredly expect that they would reduce *them* to the condition of chattels and property, if there was *any* case in which God permitted them to do so.

7. *Because, throughout the Mosaic system, God warns them against holding their servants in such a condition as they were held in by the Egyptians.* How often are the Israelites pointed back to the grindings of their prison-house! What motives to the exercise of justice and kindness towards their servants, are held out to their fears in threatened judgments; to their hopes in promised good; and to all within them

that could feel, by those oft repeated words of tenderness and terror! "For ye were bondmen in the land of Egypt"—waking anew the memory of tears and anguish, and of the wrath that avenged them.

That the argument derived from the condition of the Israelites in Egypt, and God's condemnation of it, may be appreciated, it is important that the Egyptian bondage should be analyzed. We shall then be able to ascertain, of what rights the Israelites were plundered, and what they retained.

Egyptian bondage analyzed. (1.) *The Israelites were not dispersed among the families of Egypt, the property of individual owners.** They formed a *separate* community. See Gen. xlvi. 35. Ex. viii. 22, 24, and ix. 26. and x. 23, and xi. 7, and ii. 9, and xvi. 22, and xvii. 5.

(2.) *They had the exclusive possession of the land of Goshen,† one of the richest and most productive parts of Egypt.* Gen. xlv. 18, and xlvii. 6, 11, 27. Ex. xii. 4, 19, 22, 23, 27.

(3.) *They lived in permanent dwellings.* These were *houses*, not *tents*. In Ex. xii. 6, the two side *posts*, and the upper door *posts* of the houses are mentioned, and in the 22d, the two side posts and the lintel. Each family seems to have occupied a house *by itself*—Acts vii. 20, Ex. xii. 4—and from the regulation about the eating of the Passover, they could hardly have been small ones—Ex. xii. 4—and probably contained separate apartments, and places for seclusion. Ex. ii. 2, 3; Acts vii. 20. They appear to have been well apparelled. Ex. xii. 11. To have had their own burial grounds. Ex. xiii. 19, and xiv. 11.

(4.) *They owned "a mixed multitude of flocks and herds,"* and *"very much cattle."* Ex. xii. 32, 37, 38.

(5.) They had their own form of government, and preserved their tribe and family divisions, and their internal organization throughout, though still a province of Egypt, and *tributary* to it. Ex. ii. 1, and xii. 19, 21, and vi. 14, 25, and v. 19, and iii. 16, 18.

(6.) *They seem to have had in a considerable measure, the disposal of their own time,*—Ex. xxiii. 4, and iii. 16, 18, and xii. 6, and ii. 9,

* The Egyptians evidently had *domestic* servants living in their families; these may have been slaves; allusion is made to them in Exodus ix. 14, 20, 21. But none of the Israelites were included in this class.

† The land of Goshen was a large tract of country, east of the Pelusian arm of the Nile, and between it and the head of the Red Sea, and the lower border of Palestine. The probable centre of that portion, occupied by the Israelites, could hardly have been less than 60 miles from the city. From the best authorities, it would seem that the extreme western boundary of Goshen must have been many miles distant from Egypt. See "Exodus of the Israelites out of Egypt," an able article by Professor Robinson, in the Biblical Repository for October, 1832.

and iv. 27, 29—31. Also to have practised the fine arts. Ex. xxxii. 4, and xxxv. 32—35.

(7.) *They were all armed.* Ex. xxxii. 27.

(8.) *All the females seem to have known something of domestic refinements; they were familiar with instruments of music, and skilled in the working of fine fabrics.* Ex. xv. 20, and 35, 36.

(9.) *They held their possessions independently, and the Egyptians seem to have regarded them as inviolable.* This we infer from the fact that there is no intimation that the Egyptians dispossessed them of their habitations, or took away their flocks, or herds, or crops, or implements of agriculture, or any article of property.

(10.) *Service seems to have been exacted from none but adult males.* Nothing is said from which the bond service of females could be inferred; the hiding of Moses three months by his mother, and the payment of wages to her by Pharaoh's daughter, go against such a supposition. Ex. ii. 29.

(11.) So far from being fed upon a given allowance, their food was abundant, and had great variety. "They sat by the flesh-pots," and "did eat bread to the full." Ex. xvi. 3, and xxiv. 1, and xvii. 5, and iv. 29, and vi. 14. Also, "they did eat fish freely, and cucumbers, and melons, and leeks, and onions, and garlic." Num. xi. 4, 5, and x. 18, and xx. 5.

(12.) *That the great body of the people were not in the service of the Egyptians, we infer* (1) from the fact, that the extent and variety of their own possessions, together with such a cultivation of their crops as would provide them with bread, and such care of their immense flocks and herds, as would secure their profitable increase, must have furnished constant employment for the main body of the nation.

(2.) During the plague of darkness, God informs us that "ALL the children of Israel had light in their dwellings." We infer that they were *there* to enjoy it.

(3.) It seems improbable that the making of brick, the only service named during the latter part of their sojourn in Egypt, could have furnished permanent employment for the bulk of the nation. See also Ex. iv. 29—31.

Besides, when Eastern nations employed tributaries, it was, as now, in the use of the levy, requiring them to furnish a given quota, drafted off periodically, so that comparatively but a small portion of the nation would be absent *at any one time.*

Probably there was the same requisition upon the Israelites for one-fifth part of the proceeds of their labor, that was laid upon the Egyptians. See Gen. xlvii. 24, 26. Instead of taking it out of their *crops*, (Goshen being better for *pasturage* than crops) they exacted it of them in brick making; and it is quite probable that only the *poorer* Israelites were required to work for the Egyptians at all, the wealthier being able to pay their tribute, in money. See Exod. iv. 27—31.

This was the bondage in Egypt. Contrast it with American slavery. Have our slaves "very much cattle," and "a mixed multitude of flocks and herds?" Do they live in commodious houses of their own? Do they "*sit by the flesh-pots*," "*eat fish freely*," and "*eat bread to the full?*" Do they live in a separate community, at a distance from their masters, in their distinct tribes, under their own rulers and officers? Have they the exclusive occupation of an extensive and fertile tract of country for the culture of their own crops, and for rearing immense herds of *their own* cattle—and all these held independently of their masters, and regarded by them as inviolable? Are our female slaves free from all exactions of labor and liabilities of outrage?—and whenever employed, are they paid wages, as was the Israelitish woman, when employed by the king's daughter? Exod. ii. 9. Have the females entirely, and the males to a considerable extent, the disposal of their own time? Have they the means for cultivating social refinements, for practising the fine arts, and for intellectual and moral improvement?

THE ISRAELITES, UNDER THE BONDAGE OF EGYPT, ENJOYED ALL THESE RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES. True, "their *lives were made bitter, and all the service wherein they made them serve was with rigor.*" But what was that, when compared with the incessant toil of American slaves, the robbery of all their time and earnings, and even the "power to own any thing, or acquire any thing"—the "quart of corn a-day," the legal allowance of food!*—their *only* clothing for one half the year, "*one* shirt and *one* pair of pantaloons!"†—the *two hours and a half* only for rest and refreshment in the twenty-four!‡—their dwellings, *hovels*, unfit for human residence, commonly with but one apartment, where both sexes and all ages herd promiscuously at night, like the beasts of

* The law of North Carolina. See Haywood's Manual, 524—5.

† The law of Louisiana. See Martin's Digest, 610.

‡ The whole amount of time secured to slaves by the law of Louisiana. See Act of July 7, 1806. Martin's Digest, 610—12.

the field. Add to this, the mental ignorance, and moral degradation; the daily separations of kindred, the revelries of lust, the lacerations and baptisms of blood, sanctioned by the laws of the South, and patronized by its public sentiment. What, we ask, was the bondage of Egypt when compared with this? And yet for *her* oppression of the poor, God smote her with plagues, and trampled her as the mire, till she passed away in his wrath, and the place that knew her in her pride, knew her no more. Ah! "*I have seen the afflictions of my people, and I have heard their groanings, and am come down to deliver them.*" He DID COME, and Egypt sank, a ruinous heap, and her blood closed over her.

If such was God's retribution for the oppression of heathen Egypt, of how much sorer punishment shall a Christian people be thought worthy, who cloak with religion, a system, in comparison with which the bondage of Egypt dwindles to nothing?

Let those believe who can, that God gave his people permission to hold human beings, robbed of *all* their rights, while he threatened them with wrath to the uttermost, if they practised the *far lighter* oppression of Egypt—which robbed its victims of only the *least* and *cheapest* of their rights, and left the *females* unplundered even of these. What! *Is God divided against himself?* When he had just turned Egypt into a funeral pile; while his curse yet blazed upon her unburied dead, and his bolts still hissed amidst her slaughter, and the smoke of her torment went upwards because she had "ROBBED THE POOR," did He license the VICTIMS of robbery to rob the poor of ALL? As *Lawgiver*, did he *create* a system tenfold more grinding than that, for which he had just hurled Pharaoh headlong, and cloven down his princes, and overwhelmed his hosts, and blasted them with His thunder, till "hell was moved to meet them at their coming?"

Having touched upon the general topics which we design to include in this Inquiry, we proceed to examine various Scripture facts and passages, which will doubtless be set in array against the foregoing conclusions.

The advocates of slavery are always at their wits end when they try to press the Bible into their service. Every movement shows that they are hard-pushed. Their odd conceits and ever varying shifts, their forced constructions, lacking even plausibility, their bold assumptions, and blind guesswork, not only proclaim their *cause* desperate, but themselves. Some of the Bible defences thrown around slavery by ministers of the Gospel, do so torture common sense, Scripture, and historical fact, that it were hard to tell whether absurdity, fatuity, ignorance, or blasphemy, predominates, in the compound. Each strives so lustily for the mastery, it may be set down a drawn battle.

How often has it been set up in type, that the color of the negro is the *Cain-mark*, propagated downward. Doubtless Cain's posterity started an opposition to the ark, and rode out the flood with flying streamers! Why should not a miracle be wrought to point such an argument, and fill out for slaveholders a Divine title-deed, vindicating the ways of God to men?

Objection 1. "*Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.*" Gen. i. 25.

This prophecy of Noah is the vade mecum of slaveholders, and they never venture abroad without it. It is a pocket-piece for sudden occasion—a keepsake to dote over—a charm to spell-bind opposition, and a magnet to attract "whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie." But closely as they cling to it, "cursed be Canaan" is a poor drug to stupify a throbbing conscience—a mocking lullaby, vainly wooing slumber to unquiet tossings, and crying "Peace, be still," where God wakes war, and breaks his thunders.

Those who plead the curse on Canaan to justify negro slavery, *assume* all the points in debate.

1. That the condition prophesied was *slavery*, rather than the mere *rendering of service* to others, and that it was the bondage of *individuals* rather than the condition of a *nation tributary* to another, and in *that* sense its *servant*.

2. That the *prediction* of crime *justifies* it; that it grants absolution to those whose crimes fulfil it, if it does not transform the crimes into *virtues*. How piously the Pharaohs might have quoted God's prophecy to Abraham, "*Thy seed shall be in bondage, and they shall afflict them for four hundred years.*" And then, what *saints* were those that crucified the Lord of glory!

3. That the Africans are descended from Canaan. Whereas Africa was peopled from Egypt and Ethiopia, and Mizraim settled Egypt, and Cush, Ethiopia. See Gen. x. 15—19, for the location and boundaries of Canaan's posterity. So on the assumption that African slavery fulfils the prophecy, a curse pronounced upon one people, is quoted to justify its infliction upon another. Perhaps it may be argued that Canaan includes all Ham's posterity. If so, the prophecy has not been fulfilled. The other sons of Ham settled the Egyptian and Assyrian empires, and conjointly with Shem the Persian, and afterward, to some extent, the Grecian and Roman. The history of these nations gives no verification of the prophecy. Whereas the history of Canaan's descendants, for more than three thousand years, is a record of its fulfilment. First, they were made tributaries by the Israelites. Then Canaan was the servant of Shem. Afterward, by the Medes and Persians. Then Canaan was the servant of Shem, and in part of the other sons of Ham. Afterward, by the Macedonians, Grecians, and Romans, successively. Then Canaan was the servant of Japhet, mainly, and secondarily of the other sons of Ham. Finally, they were subjected by the Ottoman dynasty, where they yet remain. Thus Canaan is *now* the servant of Shem and Japhet and the other sons of Ham.

But it may still be objected, that though Canaan is the only one *named* in the curse, yet the 22d and 23d verses show that it was pronounced upon the posterity of Ham in general. "*And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without.*"—Verse 22. In verse 23, Shem and Japhet cover their father with a garment. Verse 24, "*And Noah awoke from his wine, and knew what his* YOUNGER *son had done unto him, and said,*" &c.

It is argued that this *younger* son cannot be *Canaan*, as he was not the *son*, but the *grandson* of Noah, and therefore it must be *Ham*. We answer, whoever that "*younger son*" was, or whatever he did. *Canaan* alone was named in the curse. Besides, the Hebrew word *Ben*, signifies son, grandson, great-grandson, or *any one* of the posterity of an individual. Gen. xxix. 5, "*And he said unto them, Know ye Laban, the* SON *of Nahor?*" Yet Laban was the *grandson* of Nahor. Gen. xxiv. 15, 29. In 2 Sam. xix. 24, it is said, "*Mephibosheth, the* SON *of Saul, came down to meet the king.*" But Mephibosheth was the son of Jonathan, and the *grandson* of Saul. 2 Sam. ix. 6. So Ruth iv. 17. "*There is a* SON *born to Naomi.*" This was the son of Ruth, the daughter-in-law of Naomi. Ruth iv. 13, 15. So 2 Sam. xxi. 6. "*Let seven men of his (Saul's)* SONS *be delivered unto us,*" &c. Seven of Saul's

grandsons were delivered up. 2 Sam. xxi. 8, 9. So Gen. xxi. 28, "*And hast not suffered me to kiss my* SONS *and my daughters*;" and in the 55th verse, "*And early in the morning Laban rose up and kissed his* SONS," &c. These were his *grandsons*. So 2 Kings ix. 20, "*The driving of Jehu, the* SON *of Nimshi*." So 1 Kings xix. 16. But Jehu was the *grandson* of Nimshi. 2 Kings ix. 2, 14. Who will forbid the inspired writer to use the *same* word when speaking of *Noah's* grandson?

Further, if Ham were meant, what propriety in calling him the *younger* son? The order in which Noah's sons are always mentioned, makes Ham the *second*, and not the *younger* son. If it be said that Bible usage is variable, and that the order of birth is not always preserved in enumerations; the reply is, that, enumeration in the order of birth, is the *rule*, in any other order the *exception*. Besides, if the younger member of a family, takes precedence of older ones in the family record, it is a mark of pre-eminence, either in original endowments, or providential instrumentality. Abraham, though sixty years younger than his eldest brother, and probably the youngest of Terah's sons, stands first in the family genealogy. Nothing in Ham's history warrants the idea of his pre-eminence; besides, the Hebrew word *Hakkaton*, rendered *younger*, means the *little, small*. The same word is used in Isaiah xl. 22. "A LITTLE ONE *shall become a thousand*." Also in Isaiah xxii. 24. "*All vessels of* SMALL *quantity*." So Psalms cxv. 13. "*He will bless them that fear the Lord, both* SMALL *and great*." Also Exodus xviii. 22. "*But every* SMALL *matter they shall judge*." It would be a perfectly literal rendering of Gen. ix. 24, if it were translated thus, "when Noah knew what his little son,* or grandson (*Beno hakkaton*) had done unto him, he said, cursed be Canaan," &c.

Even if the Africans were the descendants of Canaan, the assumption that their enslavement is a fulfilment of this prophecy, lacks even plausibility, for, only a mere *fraction* of the inhabitants of Africa have at any one time been the slaves of other nations. If the objector say in reply, that a large majority of the Africans have always been slaves *at home*, we answer, 1st. *It is false in point of fact*, though zealously bruited often to serve a turn. 2d. *If it were true*, how does it help the argument? The prophecy was, "Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be *unto his* BRETHREN," not unto *himself!*

* The French language in this respect follows the same analogy. Our word *grandson* being in French, *petit fils*, (little son.)

OBJECTION II.—"*If a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall surely be punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is his money.*" Exodus xxi. 20, 21.

Arguments drawn from the Mosaic system in support of slavery, originate in a misconception both of its genius, *as a whole*, and of the design and scope of its most simple provisions. The verses quoted above, afford an illustration in point.

What was the design of this regulation? Was it to grant masters an indulgence to beat servants with impunity? and an assurance, that if they beat them to death, the offence should not be *capital?* This is substantially what some modern Doctors tell us. What Deity do such men worship? Some blood-gorged Moloch, enthroned on human hecatombs, and snuffing carnage for incense? Did He who thundered out from Sinai's flames, "THOU SHALT NOT KILL," offer a bounty on *murder?* Whoever analyzes the Mosaic system—the condition of the people for whom it was made—their inexperience in government—ignorance of judicial proceedings—laws of evidence, &c., will find a moot court in session, trying law points—settling definitions, or laying down rules of evidence, in almost every chapter. Numbers xxxv. 10—22; Deuteronomy xi. 11, and xix. 4—6; Leviticus xxiv. 19—22; Exodus, xxi. 18, 19, are a few, out of many cases stated, with tests furnished by which to detect *the intent*, in actions brought before them. The detail gone into, in the verses quoted, is manifestly to enable the judges to get at the *motive* of the action, and find out whether the master *designed* to kill.

1. "If a man smite his servant with a *rod.*"—The instrument used, gives a clue to the *intent.* See Numbers xxxv. 16, 18. It was a *rod*, not an axe, nor a sword, nor a bludgeon, nor any other death-weapon—hence, from the *kind* of instrument, no design to *kill* would be inferred; for *intent* to kill would hardly have taken a *rod* for its weapon. But if the servant dies *under his hand*, then the unfitness of the instrument, instead of being evidence in his favor, is point blank against him; for, to strike him with a *rod* until he *dies*, argues a *great many* blows laid on with *great* violence, and this kept up to the death-gasp, establishes the point of *intent to kill.* Hence the sentence, "He shall *surely* be punished." The case is plain and strong. But if he continued *a day or two*, the *length of time that he lived*, together with the *kind* of instrument used, and the fact that the master had a pecuniary interest in his *life*, ("he is his *money*,") all, made out a strong case of circumstantial evidence, showing that the master did not *design* to kill; and re-

quired a corresponding decision and sentence. A single remark on the word "punished:" in Exodus xxi. 20, 21, the Hebrew word here rendered *punished*, (*Nakam,*) is *not so rendered in another instance.* Yet it occurs thirty-five times in the Old Testament—in almost every instance, it is translated *avenge*—in a few, "*to take vengeance,*" or "*to revenge,*" and in this instance ALONE, "*punish.*" As it stands in our translation, the pronoun preceding it, refers to the *master*—the *master* in the 21st verse, is to be *punished*, and in the 22d *not* to be punished; whereas the preceding pronoun refers neither to the *master* nor to the *servant*, but to the *crime*, and the word rendered *punished*, should have been rendered *avenged.* The meaning is this: If a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand, IT (the death) shall surely be avenged, or literally, *by avenging it shall be avenged;* that is, the *death* of the servant shall be *avenged* by the *death* of the master. So in the next verse—"If he continue a day or two," his death shall not be avenged by the *death* of the *master*, for in that case the crime was to be adjudged *manslaughter*, and not *murder*, as in the first instance. In the following verse, another case of personal injury is stated, not intentional, nor extending to life or limb, a mere accidental hurt, for which the injurer is to pay *a sum of money;* and yet our translators employ the same phraseology in both places. One, an instance of deliberate, wanton, *killing by piecemeal.* The other and *accidental*, and comparatively slight injury—of the inflicter, in both cases, they say the same thing! "*He shall surely be punished.*" Now, just the difference which common sense would expect to find in such cases, where GOD legislates, is strongly marked in the original. In the case of the servant wilfully murdered, God says, "It (the death) shall surely be *avenged,*" (*Nakam,*) that is, *the life of the wrong doer shall expiate the crime.* The same word is used in the Old Testament, when the greatest wrongs are redressed, by devoting the perpetrators, whether individuals or communites, to *destruction.* In the case of the *unintentional* injury, in the following verse, God says, "He shall surely be" *fined,* (*Aunash.*) "He shall *pay* as the judges determine." The simple meaning of the word *Aunash*, is to lay a fine. It is used in Deut. xxii. 19. "They shall *amerce* him in one hundred shekels," and in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 3—"He condemned (*mulcted*) the land in a hundred talents of gold." This is the general use of the word, and its primary signification. That *avenging* the death of the servant, was neither imprisonment, nor stripes, nor amercing the master in damages, but that it was *taking the master's life* we infer.

1. From the *Bible usage* of the word Nakam. See Genesis iv. 24; Joshua x. 13; Judges xv. 7—xvi. 28; 1 Samuel xiv. 24—xviii. 25—xxv. 31; 2 Samuel iv. 8; Judges v. 2; 1 Samuel xxv. 26—33, &c. &c.

2. From the express statute in such case provided. Leviticus xxiv. 17. "*He that killeth* ANY *man* shall surely be put to death." Also Numbers xxxv. 30, 31. "*Whoso killeth* ANY *person*, the murderer shall be put to death. *Moreover ye shall take* NO SATISFACTION *for the life of a murderer which is guilty of death, but he shall surely be put to death.*"

3. The Targum of Jonathan gives the verse thus, "Death by the sword shall assuredly be adjudged." The Targum of Jerusalem thus, "Vengeance shall be taken for him to the *uttermost.*" Jarchi gives the same rendering. The Samaritan version thus, "He shall die the death."

Again, the last clause in the 21st verse ("for he is his money") is often quoted to prove that the servant is his master's *property*, and *therefore*, if he died, the master was not *to be punished*. *Because*, 1st. A man may dispose of his *property* as he pleases. 2d. If the servant died of the injury, the master's *loss* was a sufficient punishment. A word about the premises, before we notice the inferences. The assumption is, that the phrase, "HE IS HIS MONEY," proves not only that the servant is *worth money* to the master, but that he is an *article of property*. If the advocates of slavery will take this principle of interpretation into the Bible, and turn it loose, let them either give bonds for its behavior, or else stand and draw in self-defence, "lest it turn again and rend" them. If they endorse for it at one point, they must stand sponsors all around the circle. It will be too late to cry for quarter when they find its stroke clearing the whole table, and tilting them among the sweepings beneath. The Bible abounds with such expressions as the following: "This (bread) *is* my body;" "this (wine) *is* my blood;" "all they (the Israelites) *are* brass, and tin, and iron, and lead;" "this *is* life eternal, that they might know thee;" "this (the water of the well of Bethlehem) *is* the blood of the men who went in jeopardy of their lives;" "I *am* the lily of the valleys;" "a garden enclosed *is* my sister;" "my tears *have been* my meat;" "the Lord God *is* a sun and a shield;" "God *is* love;" "the Lord *is* my rock;" "the seven good ears *are* seven years, and the seven good kine *are* seven years;" "the seven thin and ill-favored kine *are* seven years, and the seven empty ears blasted by the east wind *shall be* seven years of famine;" "he

shall be head, and thou *shalt* be tail;" "the Lord *will* be a wall of fire;" "they *shall* be one flesh;" "the tree of the field *is* man's life;" "God *is* a consuming fire;" "he *is* his money," &c. A passion for the *exact literalities* of Bible language is so amiable, it were hard not to gratify it in this case. The words in the original are (Kaspo-hu,) "his *silver* is he." The objector's principle of interpretation is, a philosopher's stone! Its miracle touch transmutes five feet eight inches of flesh and bones into *solid silver!* Quite a *permanent* servant, if not so nimble with all--reasoning against "*forever*," is forestalled henceforth, and, Deut. xxiii. 15, utterly outwitted.

Who in his senses believes that in the expression, "*He is his money*," the object was to inculcate the doctrine that the servant was a *chattel?* The obvious meaning is, he is *worth money* to his master, and since, if the master killed him, it would take money out of his pocket, the *pecuniary loss*, the *kind of instrument used*, and *the fact of his living some time after the injury*, (as, if the master *meant* to kill, he would be likely to *do* it while about it,) all together make out a strong case of presumptive evidence clearing the master of *intent to kill*. But let us look at the objector's inferences. One is, that as the master might dispose of his *property* as he pleased, he was not to be punished, if he destroyed it. Answer. Whether the servant died under the master's hand, or continued a day or two, he was *equally* his master's property, and the objector admits that in the *first* case the master is to be "surely punished" for destroying *his own property!* The other inference is, that since the continuance of a day or two, cleared the master of *intent to kill*, the loss of the slave would be a sufficent punishment for inflicting the injury which caused his death. This inference makes the Mosaic law false to its own principles. A *pecuniary loss*, constituted no part of the claims of the law, where a person took the *life* of another. In such case, the law utterly spurned money, however large the sum. God would not so cheapen human life, as to balance it with such a weight. "*Ye shall take no satisfaction for the life of a murderer, but he shall surely be put to death.*" See Numb. xxxv. 31. Even in excusable homicide, a case of death purely accidental, as where an axe slipped from the helve and killed a man, no sum of money availed to release from confinement in the city of refuge, until the death of the High Priest. Numbers xxxvi. 32. The doctrine that the loss of the servant would be a penalty *adequate* to the desert of the master, admits the master's *guilt*--his desert of *some* punishment, and it prescribes a *kind* of punishment, rejected by the law, in all cases where man took the life of man, whether with or without *intent* to kill. In

short, the objector annuls an integral part of the system—resolves himself into a legislature, with power in the premises, makes a *new* law, and coolly metes out such penalty as he thinks fit, both in kind and quantity. Mosaic statutes amended, and Divine legislation revised and improved!

The master who struck out the tooth of a servant, whether intentionally or not, was required to set him free for his tooth's sake. The *pecuniary loss* to the master was the same as though the servant had *died*. Look at the two cases. A master beats his servant so severely, that after a day or two he dies of his wounds; another master accidentally strikes out his servant's tooth, and his servant is free—*the pecuniary loss of both masters is the same*. The objector contends that the loss of the slave's services in the first case, is punishment sufficient for the crime of killing him; yet *God* commands the *same* punishment for even the *accidental* knocking out of a *tooth*! Indeed, unless the injury was done *inadvertently*, the loss of the servant's services is only a *part* of the punishment—mere reparation to the *individual* for injury done; the *main* punishment, that strictly *judicial*, was, reparation to the *community* for injury to one of its members. To set the servant *free*, and thus proclaim his injury, his right to redress, and the measure of it—answered not the ends of public justice. The law made an example of the offender, that "those that remain might hear and fear." "*If a man cause a blemish in his neighbor, as he hath done, so shall it be done unto him. Breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth; as he hath caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be done to him again. Ye shall have one manner of law as well for the* STRANGER *as for one of your own country.*" Lev. xxiv. 19, 20, 22. Finally, if a master smote out the tooth of a servant, the law smote out *his* tooth—thus redressing the *public* wrong; and it cancelled the servant's obligation to the master, thus giving some compensation for the injury done, and exempting him from perilous liabilities in future.

OBJECTION III. *Both thy bondmen and bondmaids which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you, of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land, and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever.* Lev. xxv. 44—46.

The *points* in these verses, urged as proof, that the Mosaic system sanctioned slavery, are 1. The word "BONDMEN." 2. "BUY." 3. "INHERITANCE AND POSSESSION." 4. "FOREVER."

The *second* point, the *buying* of servants, has been already discussed, see page 15. And a part of the *third* (holding servants as a "possession." See p. 36.) We will now ascertain what sanction to slavery is derivable from the terms "bondmen," "inheritance," and "forever."

I. BONDMEN. The fact that servants from the heathen are called "*bondmen*," while others are called "*servants*," is quoted as proof that the former were slaves. As the *caprices* of King James' translators were not divinely inspired, we need stand in no special awe of them. The word rendered *bondmen*, in this passage, is the *same* word uniformly rendered *servants* elsewhere. To infer from this that the Gentile servants were slaves, is absurd. Look at the use of the Hebrew word "*Ebed*," the plural of which is here translated "*bondmen*." In Isaiah xlii. 1, the *same word* is applied to Christ. "Behold my *servant* (bondman, slave?) whom I have chosen, mine elect in whom my soul delighteth." So Isaiah lii. 13. "Behold my *servant* (Christ) shall deal prudently." In 1 Kings xii. 6, 7, it is applied to *King Rehoboam*. "And they (the old men) spake unto him, saying if thou wilt be a *servant* (Ebed) unto this people this day, and wilt serve them, and answer them, and wilt speak good words to them, then they will be thy *servants* forever." In 2 Chron. xii. 7, 8, 9, 13, it is applied to the king and all the nation. In fine, the word is applied to *all* persons doing service to others—to magistrates, to all governmental officers, to tributaries, to all the subjects of governments, to younger sons—defining their relation to the first born, who is called *Lord* and *ruler*—to prophets, to kings, to the Messiah, and in respectful addresses not less than *fifty* times in the Old Testament.

If the Israelites not only held slaves, but multitudes of them, why had their language *no word* that *meant slave?* If Abraham had thousands, and if they *abounded* under the Mosaic system, why had they no such *word* as slave or slavery? That language must be wofully poverty stricken, which has *no signs* to represent the most *common* and *familiar* objects and conditions. To represent by the same word, and without figure, *property*, and the *owner* of that property, is a solecism. Ziba was an "Ebed," yet he "*owned*" (!) twenty *Ebeds*. In *English*, we have both the words *servant* and *slave*. Why? Because we have both the *things*, and need *signs* for them. If the tongue had a sheath, as swords have scabbards, we should have some *name* for it: but our dic-

tionaries give us none. Why? Because there is no such *thing*. But the objector asks, "Would not the Israelites use their word *Ebed* if they spoke of the slave of a heathen?" Answer. The servants of individuals among the heathen are scarcely ever alluded to. *National* servants or *tributaries*, are spoken of frequently, but so rarely are their *domestic* servants alluded to, no necessity existed, even if they were slaves, for coining a new word. Besides, the fact of their being domestics, under *heathen laws and usages*, proclaimed their *liabilities;* their locality told their condition; so that in applying to them the word *Ebed*, there would be no danger of being misunderstood. But if the Israelites had not only *servants*, but besides these, a multitude of *slaves*, a *word meaning slave*, would have been indispensable for purposes of every day convenience. Further, the laws of the Mosaic system were so many sentinels on every side, to warn off foreign practices. The border ground of Canaan, was quarantine ground, enforcing the strictest non-intercourse between the *without* and the *within*, not of *persons*, but of *usages*. The fact that the Hebrew language had no words corresponding to *slave* and *slavery*, though not a conclusive argument, is no slight corroborative.

II. "FOREVER."—"They shall be your bondmen *forever*." This is quoted to prove that servants were to serve during their life time, and their posterity, from generation to generation.

No such idea is contained in the passage. The word *forever*, instead of defining the length of *individual* service, proclaims the *permanence* of the regulation laid down in the two verses preceding, namely, that their *permanent domestics* should be of the *Strangers*, and not of the Israelites; and it declares the duration of that general provision. As if God had said, "You shall *always* get your *permanent* laborers from the nations round about you—your *servants* shall always be of *that* class of persons." As it stands in the original, it is plain—"*Forever of them shall ye serve yourselves*." This is the literal rendering of the Hebrew words, which, in our version, are translated, "*They shall be your bondmen forever*."

This construction is in keeping with the whole of the passage. "Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the *heathen* (the nations) that are round about you. OF THEM shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, OF THEM shall ye buy," &c. The design of this passage is manifest from its structure. It was to point out the *class* of persons from which they were to get their supply of servants,

and the *way* in which they were to get them. That "*forever*" refers to the permanent relations of a *community*, rather than to the services of *individuals*, is a fair inference from the form of the expression, "THEY shall be your possession. Ye shall take *them* as an inheritance for your children to inherit them for a possession." To say nothing of the uncertainty of *these individuals* surviving those *after* whom they are to live, the language used, applies more naturally to a *body* of people, than to *individual* servants.

But suppose it otherwise; still *perpetual* service could not be argued from the term *forever*. The ninth and tenth verses of the same chapter, limit it absolutely by the jubilee. "*Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to sound on the tenth day of the seventh month: in the day of atonement shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout* ALL *your land.*" "*And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto* ALL *the inhabitants thereof.*"

It may be objected that "inhabitants" here means *Israelitish* inhabitants alone. The command is, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto ALL *the inhabitants thereof.*" Besides, in the sixth verse, there is an enumeration of the different classes of the inhabitants, in which servants and strangers are included. "*And the Sabbath of the land shall be meet for* YOU—[For whom? For you *Israelites* only?] —*for thee, and for thy* SERVANT, *and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant, and for thy* STRANGER *that sojourneth with thee.*"

Further, in all the regulations of the jubilee, and the sabbatical year, the strangers are included in the precepts, prohibitions, and promised blessings. Again: the year of jubilee was ushered in, by the day of atonement. What was the design of these institutions? The day of atonement prefigured the atonement of Christ, and the year of jubilee, the gospel jubilee. And did they prefigure an atonement and a jubilee to *Jews* only? Were they the types of sins remitted, and of salvation, proclaimed to the nation of *Israel* alone? Is there no redemption for us Gentiles in these ends of the earth, and is our hope presumption and impiety? Did that old partition wall survive the shock, that made earth quake, and hid the sun, burst graves and rocks, and rent the temple vail? And did the Gospel only rear it higher to thunder direr perdition from its frowning battlements on all without? No! The God of OUR salvation lives. "Good tidings of great joy shall be to ALL people." *One* shout shall swell from *all* the ransomed, "Thou hast redeemed us unto God by thy blood out of EVERY kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." To deny that the blessings of the jubilee extended to the

servants from the *Gentiles*, makes Christianity *Judaism*. It not only eclipses the glory of the Gospel, but strikes out the sun. The refusal to release servants at the sound of the jubilee trumpet, falsified and disannulled a grand leading type of the atonement, and thus libelled the doctrine of Christ's redemption.

Finally, even if *forever* did refer to the length of *individual* service, we have ample precedents for limiting the term by the jubilee. The same word is used to define the length of time for which those *Jewish* servants were held, who refused to go out in the *seventh* year. And all admit that their term of service did not go beyond the jubilee. Ex. xxi. 2—6; Deut. xv. 12—17.

The 23d verse of the same chapter is quoted to prove that "*forever*" in the 46th verse, extends beyond the jubilee. "*The land shall not be sold* FOREVER, *for the land is mine*"—as it would hardly be used in different senses in the same general connection. In reply, we repeat that *forever* respects the duration of the *general arrangement*, and not that of *individual service*. Consequently, it is not affected by the jubilee; so the objection does not touch the argument. But it may not be amiss to show that it is equally harmless against any other argument drawn from the use of forever in the 46th verse,—for the word there used, is *Olam*, meaning *throughout the period*, whatever that may be. Whereas in the 23d verse, it is *Tsemithuth*, meaning *cutting off*, or *to be cut off*.

III. "INHERITANCE AND POSSESSION."—"*Ye shall take them as an* INHERITANCE *for your children after you to inherit them for a possession.*" This refers to the *nations*, and not to the *individual* servants, procured from these nations. We have already shown, that servants could not be held as a *property*-possession, and inheritance; that they became servants of their *own accord*, and were paid wages; that they were released by law from their regular labor nearly *half the days in each year*, and thoroughly *instructed*; that the servants were *protected* in all their personal, social, and religious rights, equally with their masters, &c. Now, truly, all remaining, after these ample reservations, would be small temptation, either to the lust of power or of lucre. What a profitable "possession" and "inheritance!" What if our American slaves were all placed in *just such a condition!* Alas, for that soft, melodious circumlocution, "Our PECULIAR species of property!" Truly, emphasis is cadence, and euphony and irony have met together!

What eager snatches at mere words, and bald technics, irrespective of connection, principles of construction, Bible usages, or limitations of

meaning by other passages—and all to eke out such a sense as accords with existing usages and sanctifies them, thus making God pander for their lusts. Little matter whether the meaning of the word be primary or secondary, literal or figurative, *provided* it sustains their practices.

But let us inquire whether the words rendered "inherit" and "inheritance," when used in the Old Testament, necessarily point out the things inherited and possessed as *articles of property*. *Nahal* and *Nahala—inherit* and *inheritance*. See 2 Chronicles x. 16. "The people answered the king and said, What portion have we in David, and we have none *inheritance* in the son of Jesse." Did they mean gravely to disclaim the holding of their king as an article of *property*? Psalms cxxvii. 3—"Lo, children are an *heritage* (inheritance) of the Lord." Exodus xxxiv. 9—"Pardon our iniquity and our sin, and take us for thine *inheritance*." When God pardons his enemies, and adopts them as his children, does he make them *articles of property?* Are forgiveness, and chattel-making, synonymes? Psalms cxix. 111—"Thy testimonies have I taken as a *heritage* (inheritance) forever." Ezekiel xliv. 27, 28—"And in the day that he goeth into the sanctuary, unto the inner court to minister in the sanctuary, he shall offer his sin-offering, saith the Lord God. And it shall be unto them for an *inheritance; I* am their *inheritance*." Psalms ii. 8—"Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine *inheritance*." Psalms xciv. 14—"For the Lord will not cast off his people, neither will he forsake his *inheritance*." See also Deuteronomy iv. 20; Joshua xiii. 33; Chronicles x. 16; Psalms lxxxii. 8, and lxxviii. 62, 71; Proverbs xiv 8.

The question whether the servants were a PROPERTY—"*possession*," has been already discussed—(See p. 36)—we need add in this place but a word. *Ahusa* rendered "*possession*." Genesis xlii. 11—"And Joseph placed his father and his brethren, and gave them a *possession* in the land of Egypt, in the best of the land, in the land of Rameses, as Pharaoh had commanded."

In what sense was the land of Goshen the *possession* of the Israelites? Answer, In the sense of, *having it to live in*. In what sense were the Israelites to *possess* these nations, and *take them* as an *inheritance for their children?* We answer, They possessed them as *a permanent source of supply for domestic or household servants. And this relation to these nations was to go down to posterity as a standing regulation—a national usage respecting them, having the certainty and regularity of a descent by inheritance.* The sense of the whole regulation may be given thus: "Thy permanent domestics, both male and female, which

thou shalt have, shall be of the nations that are round about you, of *them* shall ye get male and female domestics." "Moreover of the children of the foreigners that do sojourn among you, of *them* shall ye get, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land, and *they* shall be your permanent resource," (for household servants.) "And ye shall take them as a *perpetual* provision for your children after you, to hold as a *constant source of supply.* ALWAYS *of them* shall ye serve yourselves."

OBJECTION IV. "*If thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a* BOND-SERVANT, *but as an* HIRED-SERVANT, *and as a sojourner shall he be with thee, and shall serve thee unto the year of jubilee.*" Lev. xxv. 39, 40.

From the fact that only *one* class of the servants is called *hired,* it is sagely inferred that servants of the *other* class were *not paid* for their labor. That is, that while God thundered anathemas against those who "used their neighbor's service *without wages,*" he granted a special indulgence to his chosen people to seize persons, force them to work, and rob them of earnings, provided always, in selecting their victims, they spared "the gentlemen of property and standing," and pounced only upon the *strangers* and the *common* people. The inference that "*hired*" is synonimous with *paid,* and that those servants not *called* "hired" were *not paid* for their labor, is a *mere assumption.*

The meaning of the English verb *to hire,* is, as every one knows, to procure for a *temporary* use at a certain price—to engage a person to *temporary* service for wages. That is also the meaning of the Hebrew word "*Saukar.*" *Temporary* service, and generally for a *specific* object, is inseparable from its meaning. It is never used when the procurement of *permanent* service, for a long period, is spoken of. Now, we ask, would *permanent* servants, those who constituted an integral and stationary part of the family, have been designated by the same term that marks *temporary* servants? The every-day distinctions made on this subject, are as familiar as table-talk. In many families, the domestics perform only such labor, as every day brings along with it—the *regular* work. Whatever is *occasional* merely, as the washing of a family, is done by persons *hired expressly for the purpose.* In such families, the familiar distinction between the two classes, is "servants," or "domestics," and "hired help," (not *paid* help.) *Both* classes are *paid.* One is permanent, the other occasional and temporary, and therefore in this case called "*hired.*" To suppose a servant robbed of his earnings, because when spoken of, he is not called a *hired* ser-

vant, is profound induction! If I employ a man at twelve dollars a month to work my farm, he is my "*hired*" man, but if, instead of giving him so much a month, *I give him such a portion of the crop*, or in other words, if he works my farm "*on shares*," he is no longer my *hired* man. Every farmer knows that *that* designation is not applied to him. Yet he works the same farm, in the same way, at the same times, and with the same teams and tools; and does the same amount of work in the year, and perhaps clears twenty dollars a month, instead of the twelve, paid him while he was my *hired* laborer. Now, as the technic "*hired*" is no longer used to designate him, and as he still labors on my farm, suppose my neighbors gather in conclave, and from such ample premises sagely infer, that since he is no longer my "*hired*" laborer, I *rob* him of his earnings, and with all the gravity of owls, they record their decision, and adjourn to hoot it abroad. My neighbors are deep divers!—like some theological professors, they not only go to the bottom, but come up covered with the tokens.

A variety of particulars are recorded in the Bible, distinguishing *hired* from *bought* servants. (1.) Hired servants were paid daily at the close of their work. Lev. xix 13; Deut. xxiv. 14, 15; Job. vii. 2; Matt. xx. 8. "*Bought*" servants were paid in advance, (a reason for their being called, *bought*,) and those that went out at the seventh year received a *gratuity* at the close of their period of service. Deut. xv. 12—13. (2.) The hired servant was paid *in money*, the bought servant received his *gratuity*, at least, in grain, cattle, and the product of the vintage. Deut. xiv. 17. (3.) The *hired* servant *lived by himself*, in his own family. The *bought* servant was a part of his master's family. (4.) The *hired* servant supported his family out of his wages; the *bought* servant and his family, were supported by the master *besides* his wages.

A careful investigation of the condition of "*hired*" and of "*bought*" servants, shows that the latter were, *as a class*, *superior to the former*—were more trust-worthy, had greater privileges, and occupied in every respect (*other* things being equal) a higher station in society. (1.) *They were intimately incorporated with the family of the master.* They were guests at family festivals, and social solemnities, from which hired servants were excluded. Lev. xxii. 10; Exod. xii. 43, 45. (2.) *Their interests were far more identified with the general interests of their masters' family.* Bought servants were often actually, or prospectively, heirs of their master's estate. Witness the case of Eliezer, of Ziba, of the sons of Bilhah, and Zilpah, and others. When there were no sons to inherit the estate, or when, by unworthiness, they had forfeited their

title, bought servants were made heirs. Proverbs xvii. 2. We find traces of this usage in the New Testament. "But when the husbandmen saw him, they reasoned among themselves, saying, this is the *heir*, come let us kill him, *that the inheritance may be ours.*" Luke xx. 14; also Mark xii. 7. In no instance on Bible record, does a *hired* servant inherit his master's estate. (3.) *Marriages took place between servants and their master's daughters.* "Now Sheshan had no sons, but daughters: and Sheshan had a *servant*, an Egyptian, whose name was Jarha. And Sheshan gave his daughter to Jarha his servant to wife. 1 Chron. ii. 34, 35. There is no instance of a *hired* servant forming such an alliance.

(4.) *Bought servants and their descendants seem to have been regarded with the same affection and respect as the other members of the family.** The treatment of Eliezer, and the other servants in the family of Abraham, Gen. chap. 25—the intercourse between Gideon and his servant Phurah, Judges vii. 10, 11. and Saul and his servant, in their interview with Samuel, 1 Sam. ix. 5, 22; and Jonathan and his servant, 1 Sam. xiv. 1—14, and Elisha and his servant Gehazi, are illustrations. No such tie seems to have existed between *hired* servants and their masters. Their untrustworthiness seems to have been proverbial. See John ix. 12, 13.

None but the *lowest class* seem to have engaged as hired servants. No instance occurs in which they are assigned to business demanding much knowledge or skill. Various passages show the low repute and trifling character of the class from which they were hired. Judges ix. 4; 1 Sam. ii. 5.

The superior condition and privileges of bought servants, are manifested in the high trusts confided to them, and in the dignity and authority with which they were clothed in their master's household. But in no instance is a *hired* servant thus distinguished. In some cases, the *bought* servant is manifestly the master's representative in the family—with plenipotentiary powers over adult children, even negotiating marriage for them. Abraham besought Eliezer his servant, to take a solemn oath, that HE would not take a wife for Isaac of the daughters of the Canaanites, but from Abraham's kindred. The ser-

* The following is Maimonides' testimony to the condition of the purchased servant. "For the *purchased servant* who is an Israelite, or proselyte, shall fare as his master. The master shall not eat fine bread, and his servant bread of bran. Nor yet drink old wine, and give his servant new; nor sleep on soft pillows, and bedding, and his servant on straw. I say unto you, that he that gets a *purchased* servant does well to make him as his friend, or he will prove to his employer as if he got himself a master."—Maimonides, in Mishna Kiddushim. Chapter 1st, Sec. 2.

vant went accordingly, and *himself* selected the individual. Servants also exercised discretionary power in the management of their master's estate, "And the servant took ten camels, of the camels of his master, *for all the goods of his master were under his hand.*" Gen. xxiv. 10. The reason assigned for taking them, is not that such was Abraham's direction, but that the servant had discretionary control. Servants had also discretionary power in the *disposal of property.* See Gen. xxiv. 22, 23, 53. The condition of Ziba in the house of Mephiboseth, is a case in point. So is Prov. xvii. 2. Distinct traces of this estimation are to be found in the New Testament, Math. xxiv. 45; Luke xii. 42, 44. So in the parable of the talents; the master seems to have set up each of his servants in trade with considerable capital. One of them could not have had less than eight thousand dollars. The parable of the unjust steward is another illustration. Luke xvi. 4, 8. He evidently was entrusted with large *discretionary* power, was "accused of wasting his master's goods." and manifestly regulated with his master's debtors, the *terms* of settlement. Such trusts were never reposed in *hired* servants.

The inferior condition of *hired* servants, is illustrated in the parable of the prodigal son. When the prodigal, perishing with hunger among the swine and husks, came to himself, his proud heart broke; "I will arise," he cried, "and go to my father." And then to assure his father of the depth of his humility, resolved to add imploringly, "Make me as one of thy *hired* servants." It need not be remarked, that if *hired* servants were the *superior* class; to apply for the situation, and press the suit, savored little of that sense of unworthiness that seeks the dust with hidden face, and cries "unclean." Unhumbled nature *climbs;* or if it falls, clings fast, where first it may. Humility sinks of its own weight, and in the lowest deep, digs lower. The design of the parable was to illustrate on the one hand, the joy of God, as he beholds afar off, the returning sinner "seeking an injured father's face." who runs to clasp and bless him with an unchiding welcome; and on the other, the contrition of the penitent, turning homeward with tears, from his wanderings, his stricken spirit breaking with its ill-desert, he sobs aloud, "The lowest place, *the lowest place*, I can abide no other." Or in those inimitable words, "*Father, I have sinned against Heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son; make me as one of thy* HIRED *servants.*" The supposition that *hired* servants were the *highest* class, takes from the parable an element of winning beauty and pathos. It is manifest to every careful student of the Bible, that *one* class of servants, was on terms of equality with the children and other

members of the family. (Hence the force of Paul's declaration, Gal. iv. 1, "*Now I say unto you, that the heir, so long as he is a child*, DIFFERETH NOTHING FROM A SERVANT, *though he be lord of all.*") If this were the *hired* class, the prodigal was a sorry specimen of humility. Would our Lord have put such language, into the lips of one held up by himself, as a model of gospel humility, to illustrate its lowliness, its conscious destitution of all merit, and deep sense of all ill desert? If this is *humility*, put it on stilts, and set it a strutting, while pride takes lessons, and blunders in apeing it.

Here let it be observed, that both Israelites and Strangers, belonged indiscriminately to *each* class of the servants, the *bought* and the *hired*. That those in the former class, whether Jews or Strangers, were in higher estimation, and rose to honors and authority in the family circle, which were not conferred on *hired* servants, has been already shown. It should be added, however, that in the enjoyment of privileges, merely *political* and *national*, the hired servants from the *Israelites*, were more favored than either the hired, or the bought servants from the *Strangers*. No one from the Strangers, however wealthy or highly endowed, was eligible to the highest office, nor could he own the soil. This last disability seems to have been one reason for the different periods of service required of the two classes of bought servants—the Israelites and the Strangers. The Israelite was to serve six years—the Stranger until the jubilee.*

As the Strangers could not own the soil, nor even houses, except within walled towns, most of them would choose to attach themselves permanently to Israelitish families. Those Strangers who were wealthy, or skilled in manufactures, instead of becoming servants themselves, would need servants for their own use, and as inducements for the Strangers to become servants to the Israelites, were greater than persons of their own nation could hold out to them, these wealthy Strangers would naturally procure the poorer Israelites for servants. See Levit. xxv. 47. In a word, such was the political condition of the Strangers, the Jewish polity furnished a strong motive to them, to become servants, thus incorporating themselves with the nation, and procuring those social and religious privileges already enumerated, and for their children in the second generation, a permanent inheritance. (This last was a regulation of later date. Ezekiel xlvii. 21—23.) Indeed, the

* Both classes may with propriety be called *permanent* servants; even the bought Israelite, when his six-years' service is contrasted with the brief term of the hired servant.

structure of the whole Mosaic polity, was a virtual bounty offered to those who would become permanent servants, and merge in the Jewish system their distinct nationality. None but the monied aristocracy among them, would be likely to decline such offers.

For various reasons, this class, (the servants bought from the Strangers,) would prefer a *long* service. They would thus more effectually become absorbed into the national circulation, and identify their interests with those in whose gift were all things desirable for themselves, and brighter prospects for their children. On the other hand, the Israelites, owning all the soil, and an inheritance of land being a sort of sacred possession, to hold it free of incumbrance, was, with every Israelite, a delicate point, both of family honor and personal character. 1 Kings xxi. 3. Hence, to forego the *possession* of one's inheritance, *after* the division of the paternal domain, or to be restrained from its *control*, after having acceded to it, was a burden grievous to be borne. To mitigate, as much as possible, such a calamity, the law, instead of requiring the Israelite to continue a servant until the jubilee, released him at the end of six years,* as, during that time—if, of the first class—the partition of the patrimonial land might have taken place; or, if of the second, enough money might have been earned to disencumber his estate, and thus he might assume his station as a lord of the soil. If these contingencies had not occurred, then, at the end of another six years, the opportunity was again offered, and in the same manner until the jubilee. So while strong motives urged the Israelite, to discontinue his service as soon as the exigency had passed, which induced him to become a servant, every consideration impelled the *Stranger* to *prolong* his term of service; and the same kindness which dictated the law of six years' service for the Israelite, assigned, as the general rule, a much longer period to the Gentile servant, who, instead of being tempted to a brief service, had every inducement to protract the term.

It is important to a clear understanding of the whole subject, to keep in mind, that adult Jews ordinarily became servants, only as a temporary expedient to relieve themselves from embarrassment, and ceased to

* Another reason for protracting the service until the seventh year, seems to have been, its coincidence with other arrangements, and provisions, inseparable from the Jewish economy. That period, was a favorite one in the Mosaic system. Its pecuniary responsibilities, social relations, and general internal structure, if not *graduated* upon a septennial scale, were variously modified by the lapse of that period. Another reason doubtless was, that as those Israelites who became servants through poverty, would not sell themselves, except as a last resort, when other expedients to recruit their finances had failed—(See Lev. xxv. 35)—their *becoming servants* proclaimed such a state of their affairs, as demanded the labor of a *course of years* fully to reinstate them.

be such when that object was effected. The poverty that forced them to it was a calamity, and their service was either a means of relief, or a measure of prevention. It was not pursued as a *permanent business*, but resorted to on emergencies—a sort of episode in the main scope of their lives. Whereas with the Strangers, it was a *permanent employment*, pursued not merely as a *means* of bettering their own condition, and prospectively that of their posterity, but also, as an *end* for its own sake, conferring on them privileges, and a social estimation not otherwise attainable.

We see from the foregoing, why servants purchased from the heathen, are called by way of distinction, *the* servants, (not *bondmen*, as our translators have it.) (1.) They followed it as a *permanent business*. (2.) Their term of service was *much longer* than that of the other class. (3.) As a class, they doubtless greatly outnumbered the Israelitish servants. (4.) All the Strangers that dwelt in the land, were *tributaries* to the Israelites—required to pay an annual tribute to the government, either in money, or in public service. which was called a "*tribute of bond-service*;" in other words, all the Strangers were *national servants*, to the Israelites, and the same Hebrew word which is used to designate *individual* servants, equally designates *national* servants or tributaries. 2 Sam. viii. 2, 6, 14. 2 Chron. viii. 7—9. Deut. xx. 11. 2 Sam. x. 19. 1 Kings ix. 21, 22. 1 Kings iv. 21. Gen. xxvii. 29. The same word is applied to the Israelites, when they paid tribute to other nations. See 2 Kings xvii. 3. Judges iii. 8, 14. Gen. xlix. 15. Another distinction between the Jewish and Gentile bought servants, claims notice. It was in the *kinds* of service assigned to each class. The servants from the Strangers, were properly the *domestics*, or household servants, employed in all family work, in offices of personal attendance, and in such mechanical labor, as was constantly required in every family, by increasing wants, and needed repairs. On the other hand, the Jewish bought servants seem to have been almost exclusively *agricultural*. Besides being better fitted for this by previous habits—agriculture, and the tending of cattle, were regarded by the Israelites as the most honorable of all occupations; kings engaged in them. After Saul was elected king, and escorted to Gibeah, the next report of him is, "*And behold Saul came after the herd out of the field.*"—1 Sam. xi. 7.

Elisha "was plowing with twelve yoke of oxen" when Elijah threw his mantle upon him. 1 Kings xix. 19. King Uzziah "loved husbandry." 2 Chron. xxvi. 10. Gideon, the deliverer of Israel, *was*

"*threshing wheat* by the wine press" when called to lead the host against the Midianites. Judges vi. 11. The superior honorableness of agriculture, is shown by the fact, that it was *protected and supported by the fundamental law* of the theocracy—God thus indicating it as the chief prop of the government, and putting upon it peculiar honor. An inheritance of land seems to have filled out an Israelite's idea of worldly furnishment. They were like permanent fixtures on their soil, so did they cling to it. To be agriculturalists on their own inheritances, was, in their notions, the basis of family consequence, and the grand claim to honorable estimation. Agriculture being pre-eminently a *Jewish* employment, to assign a native Israelite to *other* employments as a *business*, was to break up his habits, do violence to cherished predilections, and put him to a kind of labor in which he had no skill, and which he deemed degrading. In short, it was, in the earlier ages of the Mosaic system, practically to *unjew* him, a hardship and rigor grievous to be borne, as it annihilated a visible distinction between the descendants of Abraham and the Strangers—a distinction vital to the system, and gloried in by every Jew.

To guard this and another fundamental distinction, God instituted the regulation contained in Leviticus xxv. 39, which stands at the head of this branch of our inquiry, "*If thy brother that dwelleth by thee be waxen poor, and be sold unto thee, thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant.*" In other words, thou shalt not put him to *servants' work*—to the *business*, and into the *condition* of *domestics*.

In the Persian version it is translated thus, "Thou shalt not assign to him the work of *servitude*," (or *menial* labor.) In the Septuagint thus, "He shall not serve thee with the service of a *domestic or household servant*." In the Syriac thus, "Thou shalt not employ him after the manner of servants." In the Samaritan thus, "Thou shalt not require him to serve in the service of a servant." In the Targum of Onkelos thus, "He shall not serve thee with the service of a household servant." In the Targum of Jonathan thus, "Thou shalt not cause him to serve according to the usages of the servitude of servants.*" In fine, "thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant," means,

* Jarchi's comment on "Thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant" is, "the Hebrew servant is not to be required to do any thing which is accounted degrading—such as all offices of personal attendance, as loosing his master's shoe latchet, bringing him water to wash his feet and hands, waiting on him at table, dressing him, carrying things to and from the bath. The Hebrew servant is to work with his master as a son or brother, in the business of his farm, or other labor, until his legal release."

thou shalt not assign him to the same grade, nor put him to the same services, with permanent domestics.

We pass to the remainder of the regulation in the 40th verse :—

"*But as an hired servant and as a sojourner shall he be with thee.*" Hired servants were not incorporated into the families of their masters ; they still retained their own family organization, without the surrender of any domestic privilege, honor, or authority ; and this, even though they resided under the same roof with their master. While bought-servants were associated with their master's families at meals, at the Passover, and at other family festivals, hired servants and sojourners were not. Exodus xii. 44, 45 ; Lev. xxii. 10, 11. Not being merged in the family of his master, the hired servant was not subject to his authority, (except in directions about his labor) in any such sense as the master's wife, children, and bought servants. Hence the only form of oppressing hired servants spoken of in the Scriptures as practicable to masters, is that *of keeping back their wages.*

To have taken away these privileges in the case stated in the passage under consideration, would have been preeminent *rigor ;* for the case described, is not that of a servant born in the house of a master, nor that of a minor, whose unexpired minority had been sold by the father, neither was it the case of an Israelite, who though of age, had not yet acceded to his inheritance ; nor, finally, was it that of one who had received the *assignment* of his inheritance, but was, as a servant, working off from it an incumbrance, before entering upon its possession and control.* But it was that of *the head of a family*, who had lived independently on his own inheritance, and long known better days, now reduced to poverty, forced to relinquish the loved inheritance of his fathers, with the competence and respectful consideration its possession secured to him, and to be indebted to a neighbor for shelter, sustenance, and employment, both for himself and his family. Surely so sad a reverse, might well claim sympathy ; but there remaineth to him one consolation, and it cheers him in the house of his pilgrimage. He is an *Israelite—Abraham is his father*, and now in his calamity he clings closer than ever, to the distinction conferred by the immunities of his birthright. To rob him of this, were "the unkindest cut of all." To have assigned him to a *grade* of service filled only by those whose permanent business was *serving*, would have been to *rule over him with peculiar rigor.*

* These two latter classes are evidently referred to in Exod. xxi. 1–6, and Deut. xv. 12

Finally, the former part of the regulation, "Thou shalt not compel him to serve as a bond-servant," or more literally, *thou shalt not serve thyself with him, with the service of a servant*, guaranties his political privileges, and secures to him a kind and grade of service, comporting with his character and relations as a son of Israel. And the remainder of the verse, "But as a *hired* servant, and as a sojourner shall he be with thee," continues and secures to him his separate family organization, the respect and authority due to his head, and the general consideration in society resulting from such a station. Though this individual was a Jewish *bought* servant, the case is peculiar, and forms an exception to the general class of Jewish bought servants. Being already in possession of his inheritance, and the head of a household, the law so arranged his relations, as a servant, as to *alleviate* as much as possible the calamity which had reduced him from independence and authority, to penury and subjection.

Having gone so much into detail on this point, comment on the command which concludes this topic in the forty-third verse, would be superfluous. "*Thou shalt not rule over him with rigor, but shalt fear thy God.*" As if it had been said, "In your administration you shall not disregard those differences in previous habits, station, authority, and national and political privileges, upon which this regulation is based; for to exercise authority over this class of servants, *irrespective* of these distinctions, and annihilating them, is *to "rule with rigor."* The same command is repeated in the forty-sixth verse, and applied to the distinction between the servants of Jewish, and those of Gentile extraction, and forbids the overlooking of distinctive Jewish peculiarities, so vital to an Israelite as to make the violation of them, *rigorous* in the extreme; while to the servants from the Strangers, whose previous habits and associations differed so widely from those of the Israelite, these same things would be deemed slight disabilities.

It may be remarked here, that the political and other disabilities of the Strangers, which were the distinctions growing out of a different national descent, and important to the preservation of national characteristics, and to the purity of national worship, do not seem to have effected at all the *social* estimation, in which this class of servants was held. They were regarded according to their character and worth as *persons*, irrespective of their foreign origin, employments, and political condition.

The common construction put upon the expression, "*rule with rigor*," and an inference drawn from it, have an air so oracular, as quite to

overcharge risibles of ordinary calibre, if such an effect were not forestalled by its impiety. It is interpreted to mean, "you shall not make him an article of property, you shall not force him to work, and rob him of his earnings, you shall not make him a chattel, and strip him of legal protection." So much for the interpretation. The inference is like unto it, viz. Since the command forbade such outrages upon the *Israelites, it permitted and commissioned* the infliction of them upon the *Strangers*. Such impious and shallow smattering, captivates two classes of minds, the one by its flippancy, the other by its blasphemy, and both, by the strong scent of its unbridled license. What boots it to reason against such rampant affinities!

In Exodus, chap. i. 13, 14, it is said that the Egyptians "made the children of Israel to *serve* with rigor," "and all their *service* wherein they made them *serve*, was with rigor." The rigor here spoken of, is affirmed of the *amount of labor* extorted from them, and the *mode* of the exaction. This form of expression, "*serve with rigor*," is never applied to the service of servants either under the Patriarchal, or the Mosaic systems. Nor is any other form of expression ever used, either equivalent to it, or at all similar. The phrase, "thou shalt not RULE over him with rigor," used in Leviticus xxv. 43, 46, does not prohibit unreasonable exactions of labor, nor inflictions of personal cruelty. *Such were provided against otherwise.* But it forbids, confounding the distinctions between a Jew and a Stranger, by assigning the former to the same grade of service, for the same term of time, and under the same national and political disabilities as the latter.

We are now prepared to survey at a glance, the general condition of the different classes of servants, with the modifications peculiar to each class. I. In the possession of *all fundamental rights, all classes of servants were on an absolute equality*, all were *equally protected* by law in their persons, character, property and social relations. All were *voluntary*, all were *compensated* for their labor. All were released from their regular labor nearly *one half of the days in each year*, all were furnished with stated *instruction;* none in either class were in any sense articles of *property*, all were regarded as *men*, with the rights, interests, hopes, and destinies of *men*. In these respects the circumstances of *all* classes of servants among the Israelites, were not only similar but *identical*, and so far forth, they formed but ONE CLASS.

II. DIFFERENT CLASSES OF SERVANTS.

1. *Hired Servants.*—This class consisted both of Israelites and Strangers. Their employments were different. The *Israelite*, was an

agricultural servant. The Stranger was a *domestic* and *personal* servant, and in some instances *mechanical;* both were *occasional*, procured *temporally* to serve an emergency. Both lived in their own families, their wages were *money*, and they were paid when their work was done. As a *class of servants*, the hired were less loved, trusted, honored and promoted than any other.

2. *Bought Servants, (including those "born in the house.")*—This class also, was composed both of Israelites and Strangers, the same general difference obtaining in their kinds of employment as was noticed before. Both were paid in advance,* and neither was temporary.

The Israelitish servant, in most instances, was released after six years. (The *frecholder* continued until the jubilee.) The Stranger, was a *permanent* servant, continuing until the jubilee. Besides these distinctions between Jewish and Gentile bought servants, a marked distinction obtained between different classes of *Jewish* bought servants. Ordinarily, during their term of service, they were merged in their master's family, and, like the wife and children of the master, subject to his authority; (and of course, like them, protected by law from its abuse.) But *one* class of the Jewish bought servants was a marked exception. The *frecholder*, obliged by poverty to leave his possession, and sell himself as a servant, did not thereby affect his family relations, or authority, nor subject himself as an inferior to the control of his master, though dependent upon him for employment. In this respect, his condition differed from that of the main body of Jewish bought servants, which seems to have consisted of those, who had not yet come into possession of their inheritance, or of those who were dislodging from it an incumbrance.

Having dwelt so much at length on this part of the subject, the reader's patience may well be spared further details. We close it with a suggestion or two, which may serve as a solvent of some minor difficulties, if such remain.

* The payment *in advance*, doubtless lessened considerably the price of the purchase; the servant thus having the use of the money from the beginning, and the master assuming all the risks of life, and health for labor; at the expiration of the six years' contract, the master having experienced no loss from the risk incurred at the making of it, was obliged by law to release the servant with a liberal gratuity. The reason assigned for this is, "he hath been worth a double hired servant unto thee in serving thee six years," as if it had been said. he has now served out his time, and as you have experienced no loss from the risks of life, and ability to labor which you incurred in the purchase, and which lessened the price, and as, by being your permanent servant for six years, he has saved you all the time and trouble of looking up and hiring laborers on emergencies, therefore, "thou shalt furnish him liberally," &c.

I. It should be kept in mind, that *both* classes of servants, the Israelite and the Stranger, not only enjoyed *equal natural and religious rights*, but *all the civil and political privileges* enjoyed by those of their own people, who were *not* servants. If Israelites, all rights belonging to Israelites were theirs. If from the Strangers, the same political privileges enjoyed by those wealthy Strangers, who bought and held *Israelitish* servants, *were theirs*. They also shared *in common with them*, the political disabilities which appertained to *all* Strangers, whether the servants of Jewish masters, or the masters of Jewish servants.

II. The disabilities of the servants from the Strangers, were exclusively *political* and *national*.

1. They, in common with all Strangers, *could not own the soil*.

2. They were *ineligible to civil offices*.

3. They were assigned to *employments* less honorable than those in which Israelitish servants engaged; agriculture being regarded as fundamental to the prosperity and even to the existence of the state, other employments were in far less repute, and deemed *unjewish*.

Finally, the condition of the Strangers, whether servants or masters, was, as it respected political privileges, much like that of unnaturalized foreigners in the United States; no matter how great their wealth or intelligence, or moral principle, or love for our institutions, they can neither go to the ballot-box, nor own the soil, nor be eligible to office. Let a native American, who has always enjoyed these privileges, be suddenly bereft of them, and loaded with the disabilities of an alien, and what to the foreigner would be a light matter, to *him*, would be the severity of *rigor*.

The recent condition of the Jews and Catholics in England, is a still better illustration of the political condition of the Strangers in Israel. Rothschild, the late English banker, though the richest private citizen in the world, and perhaps master of scores of English servants, who sued for the smallest crumbs of his favor, was, as a subject of the government, inferior to the veriest scavenger among them. Suppose an Englishman, of the Established Church, were by law deprived of power to own the soil, made ineligible to office, and deprived unconditionally of the electoral franchise, would Englishmen think it a misapplication of language, if it were said, "The government rules over that man with rigor?" And yet his life, limbs, property, reputation, conscience, all his social relations, the disposal of his time, the right of locomotion at pleasure, and of natural liberty in all respects, are just as much protected by law as the Lord Chancellor's. The same was true of all "the stran-

gers within the gates" among the Israelites: Whether these Strangers were the servants of Israelitish masters, or the masters of Israelitish servants, whether sojourners, or bought servants, or born in the house, or hired, or neither—*all were protected equally with the descendants of Abraham.*

Finally—As the Mosaic system was a great compound type, made up of innumerable fractional ones, each rife with meaning in doctrine and duty; the practical power of the whole, depended upon the exact observance of those distinctions and relations which constituted its significancy. Hence, the care everywhere shown to preserve inviolate the distinction between a *descendant of Abraham* and a *Stranger*, even when the Stranger was a proselyte, had gone through the initiatory ordinances, entered the congregation, and become incorporated with the Israelites by family alliance. The regulation laid down in Exodus xxi. 2—6, is an illustration, "*If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing. If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself: if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him. If his master have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out by himself. And if the servant should plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children, I will not go out free: then his master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door-post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever.*" In this case, the Israelitish servant, whose term expired in six years, married one of his master's *permanent female domestics*; but the fact of her marriage, did not release her master from *his* part of the contract for her whole term of service, nor absolve him from his legal obligation to support and educate her children. Nor could it do away that distinction, which marked her national descent by a specific *grade* and *term* of service. Her marriage did not impair her obligation to fulfil *her* part of the contract. Her relations as a permanent domestic grew out of a distinction guarded with great care throughout the Mosaic system. To permit this to be rendered void, would have been to divide the system against itself. This God would not tolerate. Nor, on the other hand, would he permit the master, to throw off the responsibility of instructing her children, nor the care and expense of their helpless infancy and rearing. He was bound to support and educate them, and all her children born afterwards during her term of service. The whole arrangement beautifully illustrates that wise and tender re-

gard for the interests of all the parties concerned, which arrays the Mosaic system in robes of glory, and causes it to shine as the sun in the kingdom of our Father. By this law, the children had secured to them a mother's tender care. If the husband loved his wife and children, he could compel his master to keep him, whether he had any occasion for his services or not, and with such remuneration as was provided by the statute. If he did not love them, to be rid of him was a blessing; and in that case, the regulation would prove an act for the relief of an afflicted family. It is not by any means to be inferred, that the release of the servant from his service in the seventh year, either absolved him from the obligations of marriage, or shut him out from the society of his family. He could doubtless procure a service at no great distance from them, and might often do it, to get higher wages, or a kind of employment better suited to his taste and skill, or because his master might not have sufficient work to occupy him. Whether he lived near his family, or at a considerable distance, the great number of days on which the law released servants from regular labor, would enable him to spend much more time with them than can be spent by most of the agents of our benevolent societies with *their* families, or by many merchants, editors, artists, &c., whose daily business is in New York, while their families reside from ten to one hundred miles in the country.

We conclude this Inquiry by touching briefly upon an objection, which, though not formally stated, has been already set aside by the whole tenor of the foregoing argument. It is this,—

"*The slavery of the Canaanites by the Israelites, was appointed by God as a commutation of the punishment of death denounced against them for their sins.*"—If the absurdity of a sentence consigning persons to *death*, and at the same time to perpetual *slavery*, did not sufficiently laugh in its own face, it would be small self-denial, in a case so tempting, to make up the deficiency by a general contribution. For, *be it remembered*, the Mosaic law was given, while Israel was *in the wilderness*, and only *one* statute was ever given respecting *the disposition to be made of the inhabitants of the land*. If the sentence of death was first pronounced against them, and afterwards *commuted*, when? where? by whom? and in what terms was the commutation? And where is it recorded? Grant, for argument's sake, that all the Canaanites were sentenced to unconditional extermination; as there was no reversal of the sentence, how can a right to *enslave* them, be drawn from such premises? The punishment of death is one of the highest recognitions of man's moral nature possible. It proclaims him *man*—intelligent accountable, guilty

man, deserving death for having done his utmost to cheapen human life, and make it worthless, when the proof of its priceless value, lives in his own nature. But to make him a *slave*, cheapens to nothing *universal human nature*, and instead of healing a wound, gives a death stab. What! repair an injury done to rational being in the robbery of *one* of its rights, not merely by robbing it of *all*, but by annihilating the very *foundation* of them—that everlasting distinction between men and things? To make a man a chattel, is not the *punishment*, but the *annihilation* of a *human* being, and, so far as it goes, of *all* human beings. This commutation of the punishment of death, into perpetual slavery, what a fortunate discovery! Alas! for the honor of Deity, if commentators had not manned the forlorn hope, and rushed to the rescue of the Divine character at the very crisis of its fate, and, by a timely movement, covered its retreat from the perilous position in which inspiration had carelessly left it! Here a question arises of sufficient importance for a separate dissertation; but must for the present be disposed of in a few paragraphs. WERE THE CANAANITES SENTENCED BY GOD TO INDIVIDUAL AND UNCONDITIONAL EXTERMINATION? That the views generally prevalent on this subject, are wrong, we have no doubt; but as the limits of this Inquiry forbid our going into the merits of the question, so as to give all the grounds of dissent from the commonly received opinions, the suggestions made, will be thrown out merely as QUERIES, and not as a formal laying down of *doctrines*.

The leading directions as to the disposal of the Canaanites, are mainly in the following passages, Exod. xxiii. 23—33, and 33—51, and 34, 11—Deut. vii. 16—25, and ix. 3, and xxxi. 3, 1, 2. In these verses, the Israelites are commanded to "destroy the Canaanites"—to "drive out,"—"consume,"—"utterly overthrow,"—"put out,"—"dispossess them," &c. Quest. Did these commands enjoin the unconditional and universal destruction of the *individuals*, or merely of the *body politic?* Ans. The Hebrew word *Haram*, to destroy, signifies *national*, as well as individual destruction; *political* existence, equally with *personal;* the destruction of governmental organization, equally with the lives of the subjects. Besides, if we interpret the words destroy, consume, overthrow, &c., to mean *personal* destruction, what meaning shall we give to the expressions, "drive out before thee;" "cast out before thee;" "expel," "put out," "dispossess," &c., which are used in the same passages?

For a clue to the sense in which the word "*destroy*" is used, see Exodus xxiii. 27. "I will destroy all the people to whom thou shalt

come, and I will make all thine enemies *turn their backs unto thee*. Here "*all their enemies*" were to *turn their backs*, and "*all the people*" to be "*destroyed*." Does this mean that God would let all their *enemies* escape, but kill all their *friends*, or that he would *first* kill "all the people" and THEN make them turn their backs in flight, an army of runaway corpses?

The word rendered *backs*, is in the original, *necks*, and the passage *may* mean, I will make all your enemies turn their necks unto you; that is, be *subject to you as tributaries*, become *denationalized*, their civil polity, state organization, political existence, *destroyed*—their idolatrous temples, altars, images, groves, and all heathen rites *destroyed;* in a word, their whole system, national, political, civil, and religious, subverted, and the whole people *put under tribute*. Again; if these commands required the unconditional destruction of all the *individuals* of the Canaanites, the Mosaic law was at war with itself, for the directions relative to the treatment of native residents and sojourners, form a large part of it. "The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself." "If thy brother be waxen poor, thou shalt relieve him, yea, though he be a *stranger or a sojourner*, that he may live with thee." "Thou shalt not oppress a *stranger*." "Thou shalt not vex a *stranger*." Judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the *stranger* that is with him." "Ye shall not respect persons in judgment." "Ye shall have one manner of law as well for the *stranger*, as for him of your own country." We find, also, that provision was made for them in the cities of refuge, Num. xxxv. 15.—the gleanings of the harvest and vintage were assigned to them, Lev. xix. 9, 10, and xxiii. 22, and 25, 6;—the blessings of the Sabbath, theirs, Ex. xx. 10;—the privilege of offering sacrifices secured, Lev. 22. 18; and stated religious instruction provided for them. Deut. xxxi. 9, 12. Now, does this *same law* authorize and appoint the *individual extermination* of those very persons, whose lives and general interests it so solicitously protects? These laws were given to the Israelites, long *before* they entered Canaan; and they must of necessity have inferred from them, that a multitude of the inhabitants of the land would *continue in it*, under their government.

3. *We argue that these commands did not require the* INDIVIDUAL *destruction of the Canaanites unconditionally, from the fact that the most pious Israelites never seem to have so regarded them.* Joshua was selected as the leader of Israel to execute God's threatenings upon Canaan. He had no *discretionary* power. God's command's were his

official instructions. Going *beyond* them would have been usurpation; refusing *to carry them out*, rebellion and treason. For not obeying, in *every particular*, and in a *single* instance, God's command respecting the Amalekites, Saul was rejected from being king.

Now, if God commanded the individual destruction of all the Canaanitish nations, Joshua *disobeyed him in every instance*. For at his death, the Israelites still "*dwelt among them*," and each nation is mentioned by name. See Judges i. 5, and yet we are told that "Joshua was full of the spirit of the Lord and of WISDOM," Deut. xxxiv. 9. (of course, he could not have been ignorant of the meaning of those commands,) —that "the Lord was with him," Josh. vi. 27; and that he "left nothing undone of all that the Lord commanded Moses;" and further, that he "took all that land." Joshua xi. 15—23. Also, that "the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers, and they possessed it and dwelt therein, and there *stood not a man* of *all* their enemies before them." "The Lord delivered *all their* enemies into their hand," &c.

How can this testimony be reconciled with itself, if we suppose that the command to *destroy* enjoined *individual* extermination, and the command to *drive out*, enjoined the unconditional expulsion of individuals from the country, rather than their expulsion from the *possession* or *ownership* of it, as the lords of the soil? It is true, multitudes of the Canaanites were slain, but in every case it was in consequence of their refusing to surrender their land to the possession of the Israelites. Not a solitary case can be found in which a Canaanite was either killed or driven out of the country, who *acquiesced* in the transfer of the territory of Canaan, and its sovereignty, from the inhabitants of the land to the Israelites. Witness the case of Rahab and all her kindred, and the inhabitants of Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kirjathjearim.* The

* Perhaps it will be objected, that the preservation of the Gibeonites, and of Rahab and her kindred, was a violation of the command of God. We answer, if it had been, we might expect some such intimation. If God had straitly commanded them to *exterminate all the Canaanites*, their pledge to save them alive, was neither a repeal of the statute, nor absolution for the breach of it. If *unconditional destruction* was the import of the command, would God have permitted such an act to pass without severe rebuke? Would he have established such a precedent when Israel had hardly passed the threshhold of Canaan, and was then striking the first blow of a half century war? What if they *had* passed their word to Rahab and the Gibeonites? Was that more binding upon them than God's command? So Saul seems to have passed *his* word to Agag; yet Samuel hewed him in pieces, because in saving his life, Saul had violated God's command. This same Saul appears to have put the same construction on the command to destroy the inhabitants of Canaan, that is generally put upon it now. We are told that he sought to slay the Gibeonites "in his zeal for the children of Israel and Judah." God sent upon Israel a three years' famine for it. In assigning the reason, He says,

Canaanites knew of the miracles in Egypt, at the Red Sea, in the wilderness, and at the passage of Jordan. They knew that their land had been transferred to the Israelites, as a judgment upon them for their sins.—See Joshua ii. 9—11, and ix. 9, 10, 24. Many of them were awed by these wonders, and made no resistance to the confiscation of their territory. Others fiercely resisted, defied the God of the armies of Israel, and came out to battle. These occupied the *fortified cities*, were the most *inveterate* heathen—the *aristocracy* of idolatry, the *kings*, the *nobility* and *gentry*, the *priests*, with their crowds of satellites, and retainers that aided in the performance of idolatrous rites, the *military forces*, with the chief profligates and lust-panders of both sexes. Every Bible student will recall many facts corroborating this supposition. Such as the multitudes of *tributaries* in the midst of Israel, and that too, when the Israelites had "waxed strong," and the uttermost nations quaked at the terror of their name. The large numbers of the Canaanites, as well as the Philistines and others, who became proselytes, and joined themselves to the Hebrews—as the Nethenims, Uriah the Hittite, one of David's memorable "thirty-seven"—Rahab, who married one of the princes of Judah—Ittai—The six hundred Gitites—David's body guard, "faithful among the faithless."—2 Sam. xv. 18, 21. Obededom the Gittite, who was adopted into the tribe of Levi.—Compare 2 Sam. vi. 10, 11, with 1 Chron. xv. 18, and 1 Chron xxvi. 45. The cases of Jaziz, and Obil,—1 Chron. xxvi. 30, 31, 33. Jephunneh, the father of Caleb—the Kenite, registered in the genealogies of the tribe of Judah, and the one hundred and fifty thousand Canaanites, employed by Solomon in the building of the Temple.* Add to these, the fact that the most memorable miracle on record, was wrought for the salvation of a portion of those very Canaanites, and for the destruction of those who would exterminate them.—Joshua x. 12—14. Further—the terms used in the directions of God to the Israelites, regulating their disposal of the Canaanites, such as, "drive out," "put out," "cast out," "expel," "dispossess," &c. seem used interchangably with "consume," "destroy," "overthrow," &c., and thus indicate the sense in which the latter words

"It is for Saul and his bloody house, because he slew the Gibeonites." When David inquired of them what atonement he should make, they say, "The man that consumed us, and that devised against us, that we should be destroyed from *remaining in any of the coasts of Israel*, let seven of his sons be delivered," &c. 2 Samuel xxii. 1—6.

* If the Canaanites were devoted by God to individual and unconditional extermination, to have employed them in the erection of the temple,—what was it but the climax of impiety? As well might they pollute its altars with swine's flesh, or make their sons pass through the fire to Moloch.

are used. As an illustration of the meaning generally attached to these and similar terms, when applied to the Canaanites in Scripture, we refer the reader to the history of the Amalekites. In Ex. xxvii. 14, God says, "I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven,"—In Deut. xxv. 19, "Thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; thou shalt not forget it."—In 1 Sam. xv. 2, 3. "Smite Amalek and *utterly destroy* all that they have, and spare them not, but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep." In the seventh and eighth verses of the same chapter, we are told, "Saul smote the Amalekites, and took Agag the king of the Amalekites, alive, and UTTERLY DESTROYED ALL THE PEOPLE with the edge of the sword." In verse 20, Saul says, "I have obeyed the voice of the Lord, and have brought Agag, the king of Amalek, and have *utterly destroyed* the Amalekites."

In 1 Sam. 30th chapter, we find the Amalekites at war again, marching an army into Israel, and sweeping every thing before them—and all this in hardly more than twenty years after they had *all been* UTTERLY DESTROYED!

Deut. xx. 16, 17, will probably be quoted against the preceding view. "*But of the cities of these people which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth: but thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perrizites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee.* We argue that this command to exterminate, did not include all the individuals of the Canaanitish nations, but only the inhabitants of the *cities*, (and even those conditionally,) for the following reasons.

I. Only the inhabitants of *cities* are specified,—"of the *cities* of these people thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth." The reasons for this wise discrimination were, no doubt, (1.) Cities then, as now, were pest-houses of vice—they reeked with abominations little practiced in the country. On this account, their influence would be far more perilous to the Israelites than that of the country. (2.) These cities were the centres of idolatry—the residences of the priests, with their retinues of the baser sort. There were their temples and altars, and idols, without number. Even their buildings, streets, and public walks were so many visibilities of idolatry. The reason assigned in the 18th verse for exterminating them, strengthens the idea,—"*that they teach you not to do after all the abominations which they have done unto their*

gods." This would be a reason for exterminating *all* the nations and individuals *around* them, as all were idolaters; but God permitted, and even commanded them, in certain cases, to spare the inhabitants. Contact with *any* of them would be perilous—with the inhabitants of the *cities* peculiarly, and of the *Canaanitish* cities preeminently so.

It will be seen from the 10th and 11th verses, that those cities which accepted the offer of peace were to be spared. "*When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be, if it make thee answer of peace and open unto thee, then it shall be, that all the people that is found therein shall be* TRIBUTARIES *unto thee, and they shall* SERVE thee."—Deuteronomy xx. 10, 11. These verses contain the general rule prescribing the method in which cities were to be summoned to surrender.

1. The offer of peace—if it was accepted, the inhabitants became *tributaries*—if it was rejected, and they came out against Israel in battle, the *men* were to be killed, and the women and little ones saved alive. See Deuteronomy xx. 12, 13, 14. The 15th verse restricts their lenient treatment in saving the wives and little ones of those who fought them, to the inhabitants of the cities *afar off*. The 16th verse gives directions for the disposal of the inhabitants of Canaanitish cities, after they had taken them. Instead of sparing the women and children, they were to save alive nothing that breathed. The common mistake has been, in taking it for granted, that the command in the 15th verse, "Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities," &c. refers to the *whole system of directions preceding*, commencing with the 10th verse, whereas it manifestly refers only to the *inflictions* specified in the verses immediately preceding, viz. the 12th, 13th, and 14th, and thus make a distinction between those *Canaanitish* cities that *fought*, and the cities *afar off* that fought—in one case destroying the males and females, and in the other, the *males* only. The offer of peace, and the *conditional preservation*, were as really guarantied to *Canaanitish* cities as to others. Their inhabitants were not to be exterminated *unless they came out against Israel in battle*. But let us settle this question by the "*law and the testimony.*" Joshua xix. 19, 20.—"*There was not a city that made peace with the children of Israel save the Hivites, the inhabitants of Gibeon; all others they took in battle. For it was of the Lord to harden their hearts, that they should* COME OUT AGAINST ISRAEL IN BATTLE, *that he might destroy them utterly, and that they might have no favor, but that he might destroy them, as the Lord commanded Moses.*" That is, if

they had *not* come out against Israel in battle, they would have had "favor" shown them, and would not have been "*destroyed utterly.*"

The great design of God seems to have been to *transfer the territory* of the Canaanites to the Israelites, and along with it, *absolute sovereignty in every respect;* to annihilate their political organizations, civil polity, jurisprudence, and their system of religion, with all its rights and appendanges; and to substitute therefor, a pure theocracy, administered by Jehovah, with the Israelites as His representatives and agents. Those who resisted the execution of Jehovah's purpose were to be killed, while those who quietly submitted to it were to be spared. All had the choice of these alternatives, either free egress out of the land;* or acquiescence in the decree, with life and residence as tributaries, under the protection of the government; or resistance to the execution of the decree, with death. "*And it shall come to pass, if they will diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by my name, the Lord liveth, as they taught my people to swear by Baal;* THEN SHALL THEY BE BUILT IN THE MIDST OF MY PEOPLE."

* Suppose all the Canaanitish nations had abandoned their territory at the tidings of Israel's approach, did God's command require the Israelites to chase them to the ends of the earth, and hunt them down, until every Canaanite was destroyed? It is too preposterous for belief, and yet it follows legitimately from that construction, which interprets the terms "consume," "destroy," "destroy utterly," &c. to mean unconditional individual extermination.

[The preceding Inquiry is merely an *outline.* Whoever *reads* it, needs no such information. Its original design embraced a much wider range of general topics, and subordinate heads, besides an Inquiry into the teachings of the New Testament on the same subject. To have filled up the outline, in conformity with the plan upon which it was sketched, would have swelled it to a volume. Much of the foregoing has therefore been thrown into the form of a mere skeleton of heads, or rather a series of *indices*, to trains of thought and classes of proof, which, however limited or imperfect, may perhaps, afford some facilities to those who have little leisure for minute and protracted investigation.]

54 W 3

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS